

PROPOSED AGENDA
Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Kick-Off Meeting
June 8-9, 2005

The Beach Resort Monterey
2600 Sand Dunes Drive, Monterey, CA 93940

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Introduce CCRSG members and project support staff
2. Review and adopt ground rules
3. Review project goals and work plan
4. Review key findings of stakeholder interviews
5. Review background information and information needs
6. Begin preparations for July CCRSG meeting

MEETING AGENDA

Day 1 – June 8, 2005	
<i>9:30 AM</i>	<i>Arrival, Refreshments, Greetings</i>
10:00 AM	Welcome, Agenda Review, and Brief Introductions (CCRSG members and staff)
10:30 AM	Review, Discuss, and Approve Ground Rules (Handout 1)
11:00 AM	Review Project Goals and Roles—presentations and discussion (Attachments 1-6, Handouts 2-3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MLPA and MLPA Initiative goals and requirements • CCRSG Charter • MLPA Initiative participants -- Roles and Responsibilities • Project deliverables and overview of work plan • Adaptive management approach
<i>12:15 PM</i>	<i>Lunch</i>
1:30 PM	Review and Discuss Results of Stakeholder Interviews (Handout 4)
2:15 PM	Interactive Activity: Discuss Stakeholder Interests, Issues, and Areas of Expertise (with reference map)
<i>3:30 PM</i>	<i>Break</i>
3:45 PM	Continue Activity: Discuss Stakeholder Interests, Issues, and Areas of Expertise (cont.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrap up: Synthesis of key points, areas of convergence and divergence
4:15 PM	Review Context and Background Information—presentations and discussion (Handout 5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing California MPAs (Handout 6) • Other marine resource use restrictions • Overview of central coast planning area - geographic boundaries, key features • Existing regulatory context
<i>5:30 PM</i>	<i>Recess to June 9</i>
<i>6:30 PM</i>	<i>CCRSG Dinner</i>

Day 2 – June 9, 2005	
8:30 AM	Review Agenda for Day 2 and Questions from Day 1
8:45 AM	Review Context and Background Information (cont.)—presentations and discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of concurrent collaborative efforts • Summary of past MLPA efforts (Attachment 7) • Overview of status of existing/available data and data collection • Overview of socioeconomic survey of selected regional fisheries • Overview of research on non-consumptive use patterns
10:00 AM	Review CCRSG role in identifying and valuing alternative MPA proposals, information required, and look/feel of final work product (Handouts 7-9)
10:30 AM	<i>Break</i>
10:45 AM	Activity: Breakout group discussion and report back Focal questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would you define success for the project? • What are your greatest fears for the project? How can it be derailed? • What will you do to make the project a success?
12:15 PM	<i>Lunch</i>
1:00 PM	Logistics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed meeting schedule for July–December (Attachment 8) • CCRSG communications and distribution of meeting materials • Travel reimbursement
1:30 PM	Next steps and Preparations for July CCRSG Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review objectives of July meeting (Morro Bay) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Introduce regional goals/objectives activity (Handout 10) ◦ Introduce regional profiles activity (Handout 11) • Establish work teams to prepare for July meeting
3:00 PM	<i>Adjourn</i>

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

1. California Marine Life Protection Act
2. Conceptual Overview of the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
3. Membership rosters (Blue Ribbon Task Force, Master Plan Science Advisory Team, Statewide Interests Group, Staff and Contract Team)
4. Web links to key documents
5. Definition of key working terms (Appendix J of the draft Master Plan Framework)
6. Marine protected area references
7. Process summary of efforts to implement the MLPA
8. Draft schedule of CCRSG meetings

LIST OF HANDOUTS

1. Ground Rules
2. CCRSG Charter
3. List of deliverables and timeline
4. Stakeholder Assessment Memorandum
5. Summary of stakeholder information requests
6. Existing California MPA maps and descriptions
7. Outline of information required for MPA proposals
8. Regional process chart
9. General description of the work product from the Central Coast Project
10. Introduction to regional goals/objectives activity
11. Introduction to regional profiles activity

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: June 17, 2005

To: MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Members

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – June 8-9, 2005 Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Team

Summary – Key Outcomes and Next Steps

On June 8-9, 2005, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) participated in a kick-off meeting in Monterey, CA. The primary objectives for the meeting were to: 1) introduce RSG members and project support staff, 2) review and adopt ground rules, 3) review project goals and work plan, 4) review key findings of stakeholder interviews, 5) review background information and information needs, and 6) begin preparations for July RSG meeting.

Key outcomes from the meeting are as follows:

- Adopted ground rules for the RSG (see Attachment 1)
- Presented briefings on project goals and roles
- Formed three work teams to assist preparations for July RSG meeting. The focal areas for the work teams are as follows:
 - 1) *Goals and objectives.* The primary purpose of this work team is to provide input to staff regarding the preparation of preliminary regional Goals and Objectives. The entire RSG will discuss the topic of regional Goals and Objectives at the July RSG meeting.
 - 2) *Data presentation.* The primary purpose of this work team is to which information needs should be prepared as maps for RSG members.
 - 3) *Information scoping.* The primary purpose of this work team is to determine the scope of remaining information needs (with a key focus on pending socioeconomic information) and a timeline for generating this information. This work team will evaluate the need for additional information needs against the specific goals of the project.

The next RSG meeting will take place on July 7 and 8 in Morro Bay.

I. Introduction and Outline

On June 8-9, 2005, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) participated in a kick-off meeting in Monterey, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the main results of the meeting. The memorandum is organized as follows:

- I. Introduction and Outline
- II. Workshop Objectives, Participants, and Materials
- III. Key Outcomes
 - A. Introductions
 - B. Status of Appointment of Alternates
 - C. Ground Rules Introduced, Revised, and Adopted
 - D. Findings from Stakeholder Interviews
 - E. RSG Interests and Areas of Expertise
 - F. RSG Views on Successes and Pitfalls/Hopes and Fears
 - G. Presentation of Contextual and Background Information
 - H. Presentation: Status of Socioeconomic and Non-Consumptive Use Studies
 - I. Linking MPA Planning with Revision in Other Fishery Regulation
 - J. Central Coast Region Goals and Objectives
 - K. Regional Profiles Introduced
 - L. Work Teams Identified and Potential Members Recruited
 - M. Meeting Logistics
 - N. Turnaround and Use of Key Outcomes Memoranda Discussed
 - O. Communication Node for the Central Coast Project
- IV. Next Steps

II. Meeting Objectives, Participants, and Materials

The primary objectives for the meeting were as follows:

1. Introduce CCRSG members and project support staff
2. Review and adopt ground rules
3. Review project goals and work plan
4. Review key findings of stakeholder interviews
5. Review background information and information needs
6. Begin preparations for July CCRSG meeting

Thirty primary RSG members and eight alternate members attended the meeting. [D. Albers, S. Shimeck, and B. Sleeter were not able to attend.] The complete list of RSG members may be found at:

http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/pdfs/agenda_060805_handout14.pdf

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at:

<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meetings.html#centralcoast>.

III. Key Outcomes

A. Introductions

Scott McCreary (CONCUR) and Michael DeLapa (MLPA Initiative) welcomed the members of the RSG. Phil Isenberg offered his perspective as chair of the Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF). Gary Stacy, California Department of Fish & Game (DFG) Marine Region Manager, also greeted the participants and members of the public. As well, Michael DeLapa introduced key MLPA Initiative support staff.

All of the primary and alternate RSG members made brief self-introductions.

B. Status of Appointment of Alternates

MLPA Initiative staff reported that the process for soliciting nominations for potential additional RSG alternates had closed on June 3, 2005. MLPA Initiative (MLPAI) staff will forward the nominations to the Director of DFG and the Chair of the BRTF. Final decision on alternates is expected by the end of June.

C. Ground Rules Introduced, Revised, and Adopted

On day one, CONCUR introduced a draft set of proposed ground rules, which had been heavily informed by the stakeholder interview process. CONCUR characterized the ground rules as both a set of mutual commitments and a first opportunity for the RSG to make an agreement. Ground rules pertaining to the role of alternates and relations with the media, in particular, drew heavy attention.

Following the day one discussion, MLPA Initiative staff prepared a series of revisions, and walked the RSG through the logic of the revised ground rules.

Key revisions included:

- RSG members may have contact with the media but are asked to avoid making statements that may prejudice the project's outcome or speaking on behalf of another group's point of view.
- Discussion at RSG meetings will principally involve RSG members, Central Coast Science Sub-Team Science Advisory Team (SST) members, and staff. Primary RSG members may call upon their alternates to address issues outside of their areas of expertise. At their discretion, meeting facilitators may call upon alternate members.
- Work teams will be composed to include appropriate expertise and balance of interests. To the extent possible, work teams will be composed of primary representatives. When a primary representative is unavailable or lacks suitable expertise, an alternate representative may be selected to serve.

The RSG then adopted these ground rules. The revised version as adopted is enclosed as Attachment 1.

D. Findings from Stakeholder Interviews

CONCUR reviewed key results of the stakeholder interview process. In particular, CONCUR:

- highlighted several interests shared by many of the RSG members
- presented a series of potential challenges identified by respondents as well as stakeholder insights on how to address these challenges
- noted key information and meeting preparation needs identified by stakeholders and summarized how these were being addressed by project staff.

E. RSG Interests and Areas of Expertise

Using large GIS-based maps for reference, RSG members and alternates and SST representatives conveyed a wide range of interests and areas of expertise with regard to the Central Coast Region. Key interests included: species and habitat protection, continued commercial and recreational fishing and fishing culture, research and scientific study, and access. Participants indicated having knowledge of areas throughout the geographic range of the Central Coast, the regulatory context, and multiple species and habitats.

F. RSG Views on Successes and Pitfalls/Hopes and Fears

Participants were organized into breakout groups to discuss their views on: a) how to define success for the project, b) their fears for the project, and c) things they can do to make the project a success.

Some recurring definitions for success included: completing the task this time, arrive an outcome with broad-based agreement, having the process be perceived as fair, implementing the MLPA without adverse effects, completing a thorough review of existing MPAs.

Recurring concerns and fears included: the project's aggressive timeline, gaps in information, not being able to trust others around the table, RSG members not understanding and incorporating each other's interests, detriments of new MPAs outweighing the benefits, disproportionate effects on particular interest groups (in particular, hardships placed on commercial fishing).

Recurring comments on how stakeholders could contribute to the success of the project included commitments to: participate with an open mind, prepare for meetings ahead of time, be respectful of others' views.

G. Presentation of Contextual and Background Information

- **Role and goals of RSG.** Mike DeLapa outlined the goals of the MLPA and the MLPA Initiative. He summarized the project work plan, timeline and deliverables. He also described the role of the RSG relative to the BRTF, DFG staff, and the Fish and Game Commission.
- **Existing MPAs and other marine resource use restrictions.** John Ugoretz walked RSG members through a briefing on existing MPAs in the Central Coast region. He noted that existing MPAs had been largely created via an ad hoc, piecemeal process, often in response to political initiatives, and often with narrow purposes or unclear goals. He noted that the current ad hoc pattern illustrates the need for a more coherent network, as envisioned by the MLPA.

John Ugoretz also described the variety of other marine resource restrictions (e.g., fisheries regulations, marine sanctuaries, natural refuges) providing the context for the development and evaluation of MPAs. Staff committed to preparing a handout on additional marine resource use restrictions for the July RSG meeting.

- **Briefing on Past MPA Designation Process.** John Ugoretz (DFG) presented a briefing on past efforts to implement the MLPA. Several questions arose about how best to handle or take account of draft maps prepared during Round 1.
- **Briefing on Regulatory Context.** Michael Weber (MLPAI staff) presented a briefing on the existing regulatory context (land side and sea side) for the MLPA Initiative.
- **Role of Central Coast Science Sub-Team (SST) members.** Steve Barrager (SAT Chair) described the role of the SST, reiterating the intent of SST members to participate actively in the RSG meetings and to work alongside RSG members in preparing work products. Participants discussed the importance of RSG members having confidence in the advice of the SAT. Staff committed to work with the SAT to establish a process by which appropriate RSG questions could be “funneled” to the SAT.
- **Overview of status of existing/available data and data collection.** Mary Gleason (MLPAI staff) gave a presentation on the readily available data that the MLPA and DFG staff are assembling for this planning process. Data and information requests should be directed to her. An internet map service site has been set up to allow the RSG and general public to review data layers as they become available. That site can be accessed with a web browser at: <http://maps.msi.ucsb.edu/mlpa>. RSG members also requested that staff provide them with a list of all available maps.

H. Presentation: Status of Socioeconomic and Non-Consumptive Use Studies

Science Advisory Team members Astrid Scholz and Linwood Pendleton reported on two pending study efforts that are intended to bring more up-to-date and definitive data in the areas of socioeconomics and non-consumptive use to inform this project. Several RSG members offered comments and suggestions. There were several specific suggestions to expand the scope and coverage of the currently planned studies. Several participants also expressed the desire to review the quality of socioeconomic data available on recreational fishing. Participants discussed convening an information scoping work team to identify these issues.

I. Linking MPA Planning with Revision in Other Fishery Regulation

RSG members and BRTF Chair Isenberg exchanged views on the potential for the RSG to recommend revisions to existing fishery regulations as part of a package of recommendations that might be put forward by the group. Several RSG members welcomed this potential; others cautioned that the Pacific Fishery Management Council has an important role here, in addition to the State of California.

J. Central Coast Region Goals and Objectives

Mary Gleason introduced the topic of regional “goals and objectives” that will be a major focus for the July RSG meeting. She described the six goals from the MLPA that bound the development of regional goals. She explained the distinction between goals and objectives by describing goals as more on the level of a “vision” and objectives as steps to achieving the vision. She used the mnemonic device “SMART” to indicate that objectives should be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Timely. RSG members completed work sheets listing 1-2 goals with associated objectives and discussed some of these in plenary.

RSG members queried whether goals ought to be modified from the existing statewide goals expressed in the MLPA. They also queried as to whether each statewide goal need apply to every area along the Central Coast. Staff committed to provide additional clarification on these issues. [Note: Guidance from legal staff is as follows: The goals are the overarching guidance that the whole network must strive to achieve, while individual areas may work toward only some of the goals.]

CONCUR proposed formation of a Work Team to develop a draft set of goals and objectives to bring to the July meeting.

K. Regional Profiles Introduced

Paul Reilly outlined the intended contents of regional profiles, which he characterized as currently a “work in progress.” Providing comment on the Regional Profile will be a major goal of the RSG at its July meeting.

L. Work Teams Identified and Potential Members Recruited

Three work teams were identified to help advance work before the July RSG meeting. The work teams will focus on the following topics:

1) *Goals and Objectives*

The primary purpose of this work team is to provide input to staff regarding the preparation of preliminary regional Goals and Objectives. The entire RSG will discuss the topic of regional Goals and Objectives at the July RSG meeting.

2) *Data Presentation*

The primary purpose of this work team is to which information needs should be prepared as maps for RSG members.

3) *Information scoping*

The primary purpose of this work team is to determine the scope of remaining information needs (with a key focus on pending socioeconomic information) and a timeline for generating this information. This work team will evaluate the need for additional information against the specific goals of the project.

The following RSG members volunteered to participate in the work teams:

Goals and Objectives	Data Presentation	Information scoping
RSG and SST participants		
Darby Neil	John Wolfe	Steve Scheiblauber
Howard Egan	Walter Schobel	Jesus Ruiz
Ellen Faurot-Daniels	Marla Morrissey	Tom Mattusch
Kaitlin Gaffney	Tom Hafer	Marc Shargel
Michelle Knight	Ron Massengill	Gordon Hensley
Holly Price	Neil Guglielmo	Rick Algert
Jesus Ruiz	Eric Endersby	Astrid Scholz (SAT)
Steve Scheiblauber	Dave Edlund	Linwood Pendleton (SAT)
Staff		
Mary Gleason	Mary Gleason	John Kirlin
Paul Reilly		
CONCUR		

CONCUR explained that Work Teams ought to draw from multiple interest groups, draw from North and South perspectives, and strive to integrate the initial input of the full

RSG (to the extent it has been expressed), as well as the perspectives of the RSG members serving on the team. CONCUR explained that based on experience, a Work Team size of four to eight members works well, recognizing that Work Team efforts produce only preliminary drafts that will be brought back to the full RSG.

In other words, the intent is to cause people to “work across the aisle”. Project Manager Mike DeLapa will assign work groups based on the individuals who expressed interest. In each case, about eight RSG members volunteered to participate.

M. Meeting Logistics

Several topics were discussed under the heading of logistics. RSG members expressed a strong preference to receive materials well in advance of scheduled meetings. Staff stated their intent to strive for a one week lead time, but noted that this will not be possible in all cases. The meeting schedule was reviewed. In general, it was anticipated that primary members or their alternates would be able to attend all of the RSG meetings. Reimbursement procedures were also discussed.

N. Turnaround and Use of Key Outcomes Memoranda Discussed

RSG members made a strong request that Key Outcomes Memoranda be produced as soon as possible after RSG meetings. CONCUR reiterated their intent to turn these around within 7-10 days of RSG meetings, as noted in the ground rules.

O. Communication Node for the Central Coast Project

RSG members were requested to address general inquiries regarding the Central Coast Project (e.g., regarding agenda items for future meetings) to Michael DeLapa, the Central Coast Project Manager.

IV. Next Steps and Schedule

Key next steps for the RSG include:

1. Convene interim Work Teams
 - The Goals/Objectives Work Team proposed possible teleconferences for June 16 and 22
 - Meeting dates/times for the Data Presentation and Information Scoping work teams to be determined.
2. Staff to prepare meeting materials for July RSG meeting
3. The next meeting will take place on July 7 and 8 in Morro Bay

REVISED AGENDA
Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Meeting
 July 7-8, 2005
 Veteran's Memorial Hall
 209 Surf Street, Morro Bay, CA 93442

PRIMARY MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Review and provide targeted feedback toward refinement of draft Regional Profile
2. Review and revise preliminary draft regional goals developed by work team
3. Provide updates to RSG members on communication protocols and information development
4. Convene work teams; begin preparations for August RSG meetings

MEETING AGENDA

Day 1 – Thursday, July 7, 2005

Time	Agenda Item
<i>9:30 AM</i>	<i>Arrival, refreshments, greetings</i>
10:00 AM	Welcome, agenda review, and update on RSG membership (Handout 1)
10:15 AM	Review and discuss working draft Regional Profile <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present draft Regional Profile (Attachment 1, Handout 2) • Provide targeted feedback • Identify next steps to revise Regional Profiles
12:15 PM	Ground Rules Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and adopt ground rule for guiding public comment
12:20 PM	Public Comment
<i>12:35 PM</i>	<i>Lunch (on site)</i>
1:35 PM	Briefing on communication protocols (Handout 3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss characterization of the media ground rule • Review protocol for making information requests • Describe process of bringing RSG science/policy questions to SAT/BRTF • Review protocol for submitting alternative proposals from non-RSG members for MPAs along the central coast
2:05 PM	Status Reports from Work Teams and Update on Information Gathering <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of Work Teams (goals/objectives, information scoping, data presentation) • Status of other information gathering efforts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Socioeconomic research (Attachment 2) ○ Internet Map Service (IMS)
2:30 PM	Review and discuss: "How is your MPA doing?" (Handout 4) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation by Dr. Charlie Wahle, National MPA Center
<i>3:45 PM</i>	<i>Break</i>
4:00 PM	Review and discuss preliminary draft goals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review guidance for developing goals/objectives (Attachment 3) • Report back from work team on goals • Review preliminary draft goals (Attachment 4) • Discuss and approve regional goals • Wrap up—Identify next steps to develop objectives
5:20 PM	Preview of August RSG meeting topics
<i>5:30 PM</i>	<i>Adjourn</i>
<i>6:30 PM</i>	<i>RSG Dinner (Dockside Restaurant)</i>

Day 2 – Friday, July 8, 2005

Time	Agenda Item
8:00 AM	<i>Continental breakfast</i>
8:30 AM	Review agenda for Day 2 and Questions from Day 1
8:45 AM	Work Session Activities (informed by Day 1 discussions) Convene work sessions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Goals and objectives• Information scoping Conduct information gathering workshops <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Map “unfishable areas” (north)• Map “unfishable areas” (south)• Map “dive sites”
12:30 PM	<i>Adjourn</i>

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Regional Profile (text and color maps)
2. Status Report on socio-economic research on fishing
3. Guidance for developing Goals and Objectives
4. Preliminary Draft Goals

LIST OF HANDOUTS

1. Updated list of CCRSG members
2. DFG's Living Marine Resources book
3. Communication Protocols
4. IUCN's “How is your MPA doing?” guidebook

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: Prepared July 19, 2005 ; Revised August 2, 2005

To: Members, MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – July 7- 8, 2005 Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Team

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes and Next Steps

On July 7-8, 2005, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Morro Bay, CA. The primary objectives for the meeting were to: 1) review and provide targeted feedback toward refinement of draft Regional Profile, 2) review and adopt regional goals, 3) provide updates to CCRSG members on communication protocols and information development, and 4) conduct work sessions to begin preparations for the August CCRSG meetings.

Key outcomes from the meeting are as follows:

- Reviewed and commented on draft Regional Profile
- Reviewed and adopted regional goals
- Reviewed and discussed several communications protocols, including an approach for recording and responding to science questions
- Received briefing on guidance for evaluating MPA effectiveness
- Heard public comment on the CCRSG process
- Convened four work sessions on the topics of: draft regional objectives, data presentation needs for future meetings, socioeconomic information scoping, and gathering additional information on the topics of low and no priority fishing sites, kelp beds, and important dives sites for mapping.

Key **next steps** include (other next steps are shown in section IV below):

- CCRSG members to validate accuracy of list of science questions shown in Attachment 1 by COB, July 22, 2005. Please send your responses to ccrsgcomment@resources.ca.gov.
- Participants in work session on Regional Objectives to participate in teleconference on July 26, 2005 from 2-5 PM.
- Work Team on socio-economic information scoping to schedule and convene teleconference for the week of July 18, 2005.

The next CCRSG meeting will take place on August 10-11, 2005 in Monterey.

I. Introduction and Outline

On July 7-8, 2005, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Morro Bay, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results. The memorandum is organized as follows:

- I. Introduction and Outline
- II. Workshop Objectives, Participants, and Materials
- III. Key Outcomes
 - A. Presentation of Draft Regional Profile
 - B. Review and Approval of Regional Goals
 - C. Guidance for Evaluating MPA Effectiveness
 - D. Status of Appointment of CCRSG Alternate Members
 - E. Updating of CCRSG Roster
 - F. Review and Revision of Ground Rules to Guide Public Comment
 - G. Public Comment
 - H. Characterization of Media Ground Rule
 - I. Briefings on Communications Protocols
 - J. Overview of Science Questions Posed during the Meeting
 - K. Day 2 Work Sessions
- IV. Next Steps

II. Meeting Objectives, Participants, and Materials

The primary objectives for the meeting were as follows:

- 1. Review and provide targeted feedback toward refinement of draft Regional Profile
- 2. Review and adopt regional goals
- 3. Provide updates to CCRSG members on communication protocols and information development
- 4. Convene work sessions and begin preparations for August CCRSG meetings

Thirty-six CCRSG primary and alternate members attended the meeting. They included one newly appointed primary member and six newly appointed alternates. Catherine Reheis-Boyd participated representing the Blue Ribbon Task Force. Doyle Hanan, Linwood Pendelton, Rick Starr, Dean Wendt, and Mark Carr participated as Science Sub-Team (SST) members.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at:
<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meetings.html#centralcoast>.

III. Key Outcomes

A. Presentation of Draft Regional Profile

Mary Gleason and Paul Reilly (MLPA Initiative staff) presented an overview of the draft Regional Profile (dated June 30, 2005). Staff referenced but did not review the Profile's appendices in detail. Staff reiterated that the purpose of the Regional Profile is to assist in the establishment of regional goals and objectives, evaluation of existing MPAs, and development of proposals for new or revised MPAs.

CCRSG and SST members asked a number of clarifying questions and offered wide-ranging comments on the draft Regional Profile. These included specific factual corrections, requests to include additional data, and suggestions regarding potential additional information sources. CCRSG members and Initiative staff discussed the merits of striving for an approximately symmetrical level of detail across topics. Staff noted the importance of giving particular weight to the topics identified as germane to the MLPA.

Among the comments made, participants noted the challenge of accurately portraying trends, given that older information sources may have been collected using different (and possibly obsolete) data gathering methods. Participants suggested that additional information be included in the Profile on such topics as socioeconomic factors, the role of ecosystem resiliency, the role of marine predators (otters and sea lions) as a potential factor affecting the status of particular species, identification of unique habitats, and the abundance of habitats in the region relative to the entire state. Participants requested more information on the progress of rebuilding efforts (e.g., for lingcod) and greater integration of information from the Nearshore Fishery Management Plan. Participants also requested clarification of "intrinsic value."

During the meeting confirmation was received from NOAA Fisheries that lingcod is still formally considered to be an "overfished" species.

CCRSG members were invited to submit additional comments on the draft Regional Profile to Initiative staff at ccrsgcomment@resources.ca.gov by 5:00 PM on July 15, 2005. Initiative staff will review the comments and revise the regional profile as appropriate and practicable. A revised version of the Regional Profile will be sent to CCRSG members in advance of the August CCRSG meeting.

B. Review and Approval of Regional Goals

CCRSG members discussed two proposals for regional goals developed by the work team on goals and objectives. Both proposals were versions of the state MLPA goals customized for the central coast region. In their discussions, participants requested scientific clarifications from SST members and policy clarifications from Initiative staff. Participants also proposed alternative goals that incorporated elements of both initial proposals.

A key issue discussed was whether the central coast's MPAs should be designed and managed, to the extent possible, "as a component of a statewide network" or "as a network" in itself.' RSG members expressed a range of views as to whether the text of Goal 6 should specifically call for an independent Central Coast network or "subnetwork". Some felt such text would be advantageous; others felt this more detailed language was not necessary to meet the terms of the MLPA.

The gist of advice from both senior policy analysts (John Kirlin) and scientists (Mark Carr) was it would not make a meaningful difference if Goal 6 included text calling for a "component of a statewide network" or not; the actual network of MPAs would be the same under either scenario.

With this advice in mind, RSG members adopted a concise version of Goal 6. The full set of goals adopted is shown below.

Adopted Regional Goals

1. To protect the natural diversity and abundance of marine life, and the structure, function and integrity of marine ecosystems.
2. To help sustain, conserve, and protect marine life populations, including those of economic value, and rebuild those that are depleted.
3. To improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal disturbance, and to manage those uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity.
4. To protect marine natural heritage, including protection of representative and unique marine life habitats in central California waters for their intrinsic value.
5. To ensure that central California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement, and are based on sound scientific guidelines.
6. To ensure that the central coast's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a component of a statewide network.

Participants recognized that the goals would be further "unpacked" via development of specific objectives for each goal.

C. Guidance for Evaluating MPA Effectiveness

Dr. Charlie Wahle (National MPA Center) presented an overview based on the guidebook "How is your MPA doing?" for evaluating MPA management effectiveness. He highlighted the biophysical goals and objectives specified in the guidebook and described how particular biophysical indicators relate to these goals and objectives. He suggested that the guidebook's discussion of goals, objectives, and indicators might serve as a useful model to help guide CCRSG development of both regional goals/objectives as well as goals/objectives for individual MPAs. He noted that few MPA development and implementation efforts worldwide have been as systematic and intentional about building in evaluation up front as the MLPA effort. He also added that the central coast effort is unique in its network focus.

D. Status of Appointment of CCRSG Alternate Members

MLPA Initiative staff reported that all but two of the CCRSG alternates had been formally appointed. Staff hopes to confirm nominations of the final two alternates soon, pending receipt of background information, and to have final appointments made by the Department of Fish and Game Director and the Blue Ribbon Task Force Chair prior to the August CCRSG meeting.

E. Updating of CCRSG Roster

MLPA Initiative staff will update the CCRSG roster to include references to organizational affiliation.

F. Review and Revision of Ground Rules to Guide Public Comment

Initiative staff indicated their intent to provide opportunities for public comment at future CCRSG meetings. Michael DeLapa (MLPA Initiative Central Coast Project Manager) noted that the MLPA Initiative process provides the public with additional opportunities for comment (e.g., at BRTF and Fish and Game Commission meetings).

CONCUR proposed a new set of ground rule to guide public comment discussions. CCRSG members recommended a number of changes to the draft rules. Several participants recommended that public comment occur at set times during the CCRSG meetings. Many viewed the middle of the day as a reasonable time. Participants also acknowledged the need to balance the importance of providing sufficient time for public comment with the imperative of accomplishing the CCRSG's primary goals.

The revised ground rules for public comment are as follows. Final review and approval of these ground rules will be agendized for the next CCRSG meeting.

Revised ground rules to guide public comment

- Designated times at CCRSG meetings will be agendized for public comment. Efforts will be made to hold public comment at consistent time slots and keyed to important CCRSG work product discussions. At all other times of the meeting, comments and discussion will be only among CCRSG members and alternates, Science Sub-Team members, and MLPA Initiative staff.
- To the extent possible, public comments will be directed toward the work effort, products, or process of the CCRSG.
- Members of the public are encouraged to convey their comments to relevant colleagues who serve as CCRSG members or alternates. Members of the public are also encouraged to submit comments in writing (via email to CCRSGcomments@resources.ca.gov). Written comments will be distributed to CCRSG members.
- Public comments will be limited to up to 3 minutes per individual speaker. The CCRSG facilitation team will exercise flexibility in allocation of speaking time depending on the number of comments.

G. Public Comment

Three members of the public provided comments, primarily about information in the draft Regional Profile.

H. Characterization of Media Ground Rule

CONCUR reminded CCRSG members of their responsibilities to implement and enforce the project's ground rules. CONCUR noted an opportunity to provide clarification regarding an editorial that recently appeared in the Western Outdoor News that incorrectly characterized the media contact ground rule as a "gag order." A small group of CCRSG members (Howard Egan, Marla Morrissey, and Steve Webster) agreed to assist Initiative staff in crafting a response.

I. Briefings on Communications Protocols

Initiative staff briefed CCRSG members on a series of communications protocols.

1. Process for recording and responding to science questions

John Kirlin (MLPA Initiative Executive Director) reviewed the process by which CCRSG science questions would be brought to and addressed by the Science Advisory Team (SAT). Following the CCRSG meetings, a small team of Initiative staff and SST members will convene to clarify, validate, and prioritize requests and to coordinate responses from the SAT. Dr. Mark Carr (north) and Dr. Dean Wendt (south) will serve as primary SAT liaisons. Dr. Rick Starr and Dr. Linwood Pendelton will serve as their respective alternates. Graduate students Carrie Kappel and Heather Galindo will assist in collecting the science questions and requests.

John K. reminded CCRSG members that response to science questions will be guided by the overarching CCRSG imperatives of accomplishing its goals in a timely fashion and operating from the "best readily available science." He noted that the standard of "best readily available science" creates a strong bias toward action, noting that Joe Milton (DFG legal Council) interpreted this to mean that the MLPA emphasizes timeliness over quality. John K. also clarified that the SAT, through its SST members, will work to support the efforts of the CCRSG in a co-inventive and iterative fashion (i.e., the SAT will not withhold its scientific judgment until after the CCRSG has submitted MPA proposals to the Blue Ribbon Task Force).

Initiative staff will work with SST members to develop a clear protocol to capture scientific questions during meetings; confirm, validate, and prioritize requests; and generate meaningful responses.

2. Protocol for making other information requests

Michael DeLapa indicated that other information requests (e.g., for data or other information) should be made to Initiative staff via a web-based form at:

http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/cc_request.html. General comments and contributions should be sent by email at MLPAcomments@resources.ca.gov.

3. Protocol for submitting alternative proposals from non-CCRSG members for MPAs along the Central Coast

Michael DeLapa noted that non-CCRSG members could offer suggestions for single or multiple MPAs within the central coast study region. To facilitate the evaluation of such proposals, he recommended that they be submitted between September 1 and October 15, 2005 and adhere to the format and guidance provided in Appendix F of the Master Plan Framework. All such proposals will be made public. At its discretion, the CCRSG and the SAT, working with Initiative staff, may assess similar proposals jointly and may judge a proposal as sufficiently at variance with the MLPA to not warrant further evaluation.

4. Work Team communications

Initiative staff acknowledged that work team members may wish to consult with other CCRSG members regarding the efforts and progress of their work teams, but that no ground rule exists to guide such communication. CONCUR recommended that such communications be guided by a “common sense” approach that respects the “inventing without committing” quality of work teams. This includes taking care not to speak for other work team members or prejudge outcomes if doing so might be harmful to the process.

J. Recap of Science Questions Posed during the Meeting

Dr. Mark Carr (SST member) recapped the list of science questions posed by CCRSG members during the meeting. Attachment 1 provides the draft CCRSG questions. Initiative staff will work with SST members to review, validate, and prioritize the requests to help guide SAT responses.

CCRSG members are requested to validate the accuracy of the list of science questions shown in Attachment 1 by COB, July 22, 2005. Please send your responses to ccrsgcomment@resources.ca.gov.

K. Day 2 Work Sessions

On day 2 of the meeting, CCRSG members participated in one of four concurrent work sessions.

1. Work Session on Brainstorming Regional Objectives

Purpose. The purpose of this work session was to brainstorm regional objectives for each of the approved regional goals.

Participants. CCRSG participants in the work session included: Art Seavey, Huff McGonical, Howard Egan, Kaitilin Gaffney, Marla Morrissey, Steve Scheiblaue, Milos Radakovich, Jay Elder, Jesus Ruiz, Mike Osmond, Bob Hather, Ellen Faurot-Daniels, John Pearse, Ray Fields, and D'Anne Albers. SST members

included Mark Carr, Dean Wendt, and Rick Starr. MLPA Initiative staff included Paul Reilly, Maura Leos, and Eric Poncelet.

Key Accomplishments. Work session participants brainstormed over 50 possible objectives for the six approved regional goals.

Planned Next Steps.

Work session members will work with Initiative staff to produce a draft set of proposed regional objectives for consideration by the full CCRSG at its August meeting. Interim work steps include (dates are provisional):

- 1) Work session members will provide additional brainstormed regional objectives to Initiative staff by COB, July 15, 2005.
- 2) MLPA Initiative staff will compile a new full list of brainstormed objectives. MLPA Initiative staff will then review and reconfigure the brainstormed proposals to produce a "menu" of possible objectives. Initiative staff may consolidate some of the proposed objectives or propose new ones, as appropriate. Staff will base its review of the draft objectives on information present in the draft Regional Profile. Staff will transmit this "menu" to Work Team members by close of business on July 21. Staff will also transmit the full list of brainstormed objectives for reference.
- 3) The Regional Objectives Work Team will meet via teleconference on July 26 from 2-5 PM to discuss further clarifying or refining the list of draft objectives.
- 4) Drawing from Work Team discussions and the outcomes of the July 26 teleconference, MLPA Initiative staff will revise the list of draft objectives. Staff will transmit these revised draft objectives to CCRSG members on or around August 3 with the August meeting packet.
- 5) The full CCRSG will address the draft objectives at August 10-11 meeting in Monterey. A key objective of this meeting is to approve a set of Regional Objectives.

2. Data Presentation Work Session

Purpose. The purpose of this work session was to identify which data needed to be mapped to best assist in the development of CCRSG work products. In particular, participants were asked to focus on which maps they might use outside of meetings to discuss issues with their constituents. Participants were also asked to focus on which items in the Regional Profile would require small-scale maps.

Participants. Contributing CCRSG members included: Eric Endersby, Ron Massengill, Kris Lindstrom, Tom Hafer. They were assisted by John Ugoretz and Rita Bunzel (MLPA Initiative staff).

Key Accomplishments. Participants requested that maps be developed and printed out (with appropriate background image and scale for each) for the upcoming CCRSG meetings as follows:

August meeting

- Habitats – smaller map sections with larger scale. These should include kelp beds, bottom contours w/ depths, ocean processes (currents, upwelling).
- Existing MPAs and “other closures” – e.g., Essential Fish Habitat no trawl areas, existing MPAs, rockfish trawl restrictions (permanent), power plant closures, etc.
- Dive sites and coastal access (private land, commercial skiff fishing boat access). This map may separate or combined with a map on existing closures and research sites (PISCO research sites, TENERA sites, Intertidal research sites).

September Meeting

- Commercial catch, Nearshore fish and spot prawn with separate colors on same map – possible addition of halibut – check due date for data.
- Recreational catch – check due date for data.

Potential Additional Maps

- Existing and proposed point source discharges (if possible)
- Proposed oil leases (may not be able to map)

Participants also identified additional questions and requests to be addressed. These included:

- 1) Can we make kelp layers different color to show year comparisons on the IMS site?
- 2) Can we map blocks of kelp and show harvest tonnage by block?
- 3) Is it possible to show online the type of kelp administrative block open/leased/closed? [Note: All kelp in the State is managed for commercial use within discrete "administrative beds". These are not specific biological areas, but are evenly distributed areas. Each bed is either open (any permitted kelp harvester can use it), leased (only a specific harvester has rights to use it), or closed (no commercial kelp harvest allowed).]
- 4) How is the recreational fishing effort set-up? Specifically, how are the data collected, and how does this relate to total effort vs. those people interviewed?
- 5) Is it possible to get Central Coast Region 2004 kelp area maps?
- 6) We need to make sure that spot prawn maps maintain privacy of individual's locations (there are only 4 fishermen between Pigeon Pt. and Lopez, making this difficult).

Planned Next Steps.

Initiative staff will make available the maps identified above to CCRSG members in the timeframes noted. Staff will also address the questions raised and report on this at the next CCRSG meeting.

3. Work Session on Socioeconomic Information Scoping

Purpose. The purpose of this work session was to get regional stakeholder input on what: (1) baseline socio-economic data needs to be collected, (2) socio-economic data would be useful, (3) areas will have gaps, and (4) are existing sources of socio-economic data related to the MLPA Initiative.

Participants. Participating members from the CCRSG included: Rick Algert, Gordon Hensley, Tom Mattusch, Linda McIntyre, Marc Shargel, Steve Shimek, and Steve Webster. Astrid Sholz participated from the SST, and John Kirlin and Kirk Sturm assisted as Initiative staff. Trudy O'Brien observed as a member of the public.

Key Accomplishments. Work session participants came to the conclusion that the best opportunity for meaningful socio-economic analysis can only occur after MPA's are proposed. They also concluded that some (not defined at this point, needs further discussion) baseline community profile/inventory needs to be performed in the study area for those areas (harbors, cities and counties) that are adjacent to the ocean.

Planned Next Steps. Key next steps include the following:

- 1) Kirk to review Moss Landing socio-economic study by Monday, July 18, and list key indicators from that study.
- 2) Kirk to generate a preliminary Work Plan to generate the baseline community profile/inventory referenced above.
- 3) Work Team members will continue to identify existing socio-economic data sources (i.e.: 2005? UCSB Economic Study for San Luis Obispo area).
- 4) A Work Team conference call will take place either July 20, 21, or 22.

Handouts from the Meeting. John Kirlin handed out an Assessment Template (with relative scoring). Kirk Sturm handed out a memo with some thoughts on data.

4. Work Session on Collecting Information for Mapping

Purpose. The purpose of this work session was to gather information from Regional Stakeholders on low and no priority fishing sites, important kelp beds, and important dive sites. Stakeholders were provided maps of the central coast region and data logs, and invited to map information from personal experience.

Participants. Contributing CCRSG members included:
Ray Fields - high priority commercial kelp beds
Art Seavey - high priority commercial kelp beds
Neil Guglielmo - Low/no priority purse-seining areas
Eric Endersby - high priority dive sites

Tom Mattock - high priority dive sites/ spear fishing
Bill Diller - low/no priority Dungeness crab sites
Staff participants included: Michael DeLapa (MLPA Initiative staff), Aaron Tinker (MLPA Initiative staff), Chris Ball (DFG staff for MLPA Initiative), and Will McClintock (UCSB GIS/IMS data manager).

Key Accomplishments. Contributors mapped information on low and no priority fishing areas by gear type; commercially valuable kelp beds; and high priority dive sites.

Planned Next Steps. Chris Ball will transfer contributors' data from hand drawn maps to digital GIS data layer. Data on digital maps will then be made available to other Regional Stakeholders to view and validate before posting as final data layers. All unvalidated maps from this effort will initially appear in "draft" folder on GIS/IMS web site.

IV. Next Steps and Schedule

Key next steps for the CCRSG include:

A. CCRSG tasks

1. CCRSG members to provide additional comments on the draft Regional Profile to Initiative staff at ccrsgcomment@resources.ca.gov by COB on July 15, 2005.
2. CCRSG members to validate accuracy of list of science questions shown in Attachment 1 by COB, July 22, 2005. Please send your responses to ccrsgcomment@resources.ca.gov. Initiative staff will then work with SST members to review, validate, and prioritize the sciences questions posed and to coordinate SAT responses.
3. CCRSG to review and approve ground rules for public comment at its next meeting.

B. CCRSG and Initiative staff shared tasks

1. Convene interim Work Team/Work Session meetings
 - Participants from the Regional Objectives work session will meet by teleconference on July 26 from 2-5 PM.
 - The Socioeconomic information scoping Work Team will meet by teleconference either July 20, 21, or 22 (to be determined).
2. Initiative staff to work with a small group of CCRSG members (Howard Egan, Marla Morrissey, and Steve Webster) to craft a clarifying response to the editorial that appeared in the Western Outdoor News.

C. MLPA Initiative staff tasks

1. Initiative staff to confirm nominations of final two CCRSG alternate members, pending receipt of background information. Initiative staff to have final appointments made by the Department of Fish and Game Director and the Blue Ribbon Task Force Chair prior to the August CCRSG meeting.
2. Initiative staff to update the CCRSG roster to include references to resource use affiliation in advance of the August meeting.
3. Initiative staff to prepare a clear protocol to guide process for collecting and responding to science questions.
4. Initiative staff to prepare key meeting materials for August RSG meeting. This will include a revised draft Regional Profile and a draft set of proposed Regional Objectives.

The next meeting will take place on August 10-11 in Monterey, CA.

REVISED AGENDA
Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Meeting
August 10-11, 2005
The Beach Resort Monterey
2600 Sand Dunes Drive, Monterey, CA

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Review and discuss second draft of Regional Profile
2. Review, discuss, and adopt Regional Objectives
3. Review draft monitoring and evaluation report
4. Begin preparations for September CCRSG meeting

MEETING AGENDA

Day 1 – August 10, 2005

Time	Agenda Item
9:30 AM	<i>Arrival, Refreshments, Greetings</i>
10:00 AM	Welcome, Agenda Review, and update on CCRSG membership
10:20 AM	Review and discuss second draft of Regional Profile <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present updated draft Regional Profile (Attachment 1) • Provide targeted feedback • Identify next steps to finalize Regional Profile
11:50 AM	Ground Rules Update - Review and adopt ground rule for guiding public comment
11:55 PM	Public Comment
12:15 PM	<i>Lunch (on site) – Presentations from Science Advisory Team (SAT) and discussion</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Presentation on marine ecosystems and ecosystem services</i> <i>Dr. Mark Carr, University of California, Santa Cruz (Handout 1)</i> • <i>Presentation on marine habitats</i> <i>Dr. Rick Starr, Marine Advisor for the University of California Sea Grant Extension Program for Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties (Handout 2)</i> • <i>Presentation on the use of economic data in the design and evaluation of MPAs</i> <i>Dr. Linwood Pendleton, University of California, Los Angeles (Handout 3)</i>
2:15 PM	Updates and briefings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefing - Procedure for managing requests for science-based information (Attachment 2, Attachment 3) • Status of responses to science questions (Attachment 4) • Status of Work Teams • Status of fishers values project • Status of CCRSG response to Western Outdoor News Editorial (Attachment 5)
3:00 PM	<i>Break</i>
3:15 PM	Review and discuss draft Regional Objectives (Attachment 6) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce draft Regional Objectives and review process by which they were created • Review and discuss individual Regional Objectives
5:30 PM	<i>Adjourn</i>
6:30 PM	<i>CCRSG Dinner (TBD)</i>

Day 2 – August 11, 2005

Time	Agenda Item
8:30 AM	Review agenda for Day 2 and Questions from Day 1
8:45 AM	Present and discuss draft monitoring and evaluation outline
9:45 AM	Review and discuss draft Regional Objectives (cont.) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review and discuss individual objectives
10:30 AM	<i>Break</i>
10:45 AM	Review and discuss draft Regional Objectives (cont.) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review and discuss individual objectives
12:15 PM	<i>Lunch (on site)</i>
1:30 PM	Adopt Regional Objectives
2:00 PM	Present guidance for evaluating existing MPAs
2:30 PM	Review meeting accomplishments and next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review accomplishments of August meeting• Review objectives of September CCRSG meeting (Morro Bay)
2:45 PM	<i>Break</i>
3:00 PM	Work sessions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Socioeconomic information scoping• Evaluation of MPAs• Developing indicators for Regional Objectives• Information mapping
4:00 PM	<i>Adjourn</i>

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

1. Regional profile and cover letter (2 documents)
2. Procedure for managing requests for science-based information
3. Definitions of MLPA terms
4. Responses to request for information (2 documents)
5. Western Outdoor News response letter
6. Regional objectives memorandum, brainstormed list of objectives, goal/objective matrix (3 documents)

LIST OF HANDOUTS

1. CCR Pres_Ecosystems&Ecosystem_Srvcs
2. CCR Pres_Marine_Habitats
3. CCR Pres_Economic Impacts MPA

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: Prepared August 22, 2005; Revised September 16, 2005

To: Members, MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – August 10-11, 2005 Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Team

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes and Next Steps

On August 10-11, 2005, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Monterey, CA. The primary objectives for the meeting were to: 1) review and discuss second draft of Regional Profile 2) review, discuss, and adopt Regional Objectives, 3) review draft monitoring and evaluation report, and 4) begin preparations for the September CCRSG meeting.

Key outcomes from the meeting are as follows:

- CCRSG received an update and commented on a second draft of Regional Profile. The update included a briefing on the progress of mapping.
- CCRSG engaged in robust review and revision of draft provisional Regional Objectives. Participants reached substantial agreement on several specific objectives, which will be revisited in the context of the full package of objectives. Several additional issues remain to be addressed.
- CCRSG expressed the overall view that the draft provisional Regional Objectives are approaching a reasonable first cut, recognizing that more work is to be done. Further deliberation is scheduled for the September CCRSG meeting.
- CCRSG received a briefing on the anticipated SAT and BRTF review of the draft Regional Profile and the draft provisional Regional Objectives. SAT review will occur on August 30; BRTF review will take place on September 28-29.
- Science Advisory Team members made presentations to the CCRSG on the topics of: 1) ecosystems and ecosystems services, 2) marine habitats, and 3) the use of economic data in the design of MPAs.
- CCRSG received a briefing on preliminary efforts to develop an MLPA monitoring and evaluation plan.
- CCRSG received a briefing on the progress of the socioeconomic work team.
- CCRSG unanimously adopted a ground rule governing public comment.

Key **next steps** include (other next steps are shown in section IV below):

- Initiative staff will consider how best to continue the development of Regional Objectives. This may include reconvening various configurations of work teams.

The next CCRSG meeting will take place on September 7-8, 2005 in Cambria, CA.

I. Introduction and Outline

On August 10-11, 2005, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Monterey, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results. The memorandum is organized as follows:

- I. Introduction and Outline
- II. Workshop Objectives, Participants, and Materials
- III. Key Outcomes
 - A. Presentation of Second Regional Profile
 - B. Review and discussion of draft provisional Regional Objectives
 - C. Presentation on monitoring and evaluation outline
 - D. Science Advisory Team (SAT) presentations
 - E. Science questions and information requests
 - F. Status of work teams and ongoing data gathering efforts
 - G. Status of appointments of CCRSG alternate members
 - H. Review and adoption of ground rules to guide public comment
 - I. Public Comment
- IV. Next Steps

II. Meeting Objectives, Participants, and Materials

The primary objectives for the meeting were as follows:

- 1. Review and discuss second draft of Regional Profile
- 2. Review, discuss, and adopt Regional Objectives
- 3. Review draft monitoring and evaluation report
- 4. Begin preparations for the September CCRSG meeting

Thirty-six CCRSG primary and alternate members attended the meeting. Susan Golding participated as a representative of the Blue Ribbon Task Force. Linwood Pendelton, Rick Starr, and Mark Carr participated as Science Sub-Team (SST) members.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at:
<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meetings.html#centralcoast>.

III. Key Outcomes

A. Presentation of Second Draft of Regional Profile

Mary Gleason and Paul Reilly (MLPA Initiative staff) presented a briefing on the second draft of the Regional Profile (dated August 1, 2005). The Regional Profile is intended to inform future CCRSG evaluation and analysis of MPAs. It serves as a conduit to available information rather than a definitive summary of all available information.

1. Status of information collection and review

Information is still being collected for the Regional Profile, and data layers are still being added to the maps.

CCRSG members were invited to submit additional comments on the Regional Profile to Initiative staff at ccrsgcomment@resources.ca.gov by 5:00 PM on August 16, 2005. Initiative staff will review the comments and revise the regional profile as appropriate and practicable. It is staff's intention to present a final version of the Regional Profile to CCRSG members at the September CCRSG meeting.

The Regional Profile is currently being reviewed by SAT members and will be discussed at the SAT's August 30 meeting. The BRTF will review the Regional Profile at its September 28-29 meeting. Initiative staff will update the CCRSG regarding the results of this review.

2. Recap of comments received

Participants offered a wide range of comments on the second draft of the Regional Profile. Participants, for example, requested more information on ecosystem functions, additional historical data on commercial landings, expansion of the non-consumptive section, and clarifications on the list of species likely to benefit from MPAs. Stakeholders requested that language be added to indicate that the final version will be a living document. As well, several participants suggested building in a more specific peer review step.

Some of the recently developed socioeconomic data drew extensive comments. CCRSG members posed questions on the study objectives, sample selection, and method of reporting of results. Participants expressed particular concern regarding the preliminary results presented in Table 24. Some cautioned that the framing of this information might be offensive to fishermen. Others saw a problem with lumping together commercial and recreational fishing.

3. Steps toward completion of Regional Profile

Staff intends to complete the Regional Profile by early September. Nevertheless, data and information collection will continue throughout the planning process to

support CCRSG efforts. Initiative staff does not intend to seek formal adoption of this document.

B. Review and discussion of draft provisional Regional Objectives

1. Review of draft provisional Regional Objectives

CCRSG members participated in an extended review and discussion of draft provisional Regional Objectives. Initiative staff kicked off the discussion by describing the “provisional” nature of the Regional Objectives. Staff noted that the provisional Regional Objectives will be reviewed by the SAT at its next meeting on August 30 and by the BRTF on September 28-29.

Initiative staff requested that CCRSG participants focus on the draft provisional Regional Objectives in the aggregate to see if their interests were being served. Initiative staff also reminded CCRSG members that while consensus support for the objectives is not required, the adopted ground rules encourage group members to strive for the highest degree of consensus possible.

On day 1, participants commented on the full list of draft provisional Regional Objectives. After this initial discussion, staff reframed certain areas of disagreement as “choices” to be made by the CCRSG. On day 2, participants addressed these issues in turn, working through approximately half of them.

Facilitators and Initiative staff structured straw votes as a tool to help gauge CCRSG support for alternative text for individual provisional objectives. For some objectives, several alternate working configurations were discussed and considered. Some of these proposals received very broad support. The support for others was more divided.

Staff will use the outcomes of these discussions and straw votes to prepare a revised version of the draft provisional Regional Objectives. Staff may also request the assistance of the Regional Objectives Work Team to provide input on the key “choices” remaining from the August meeting. Final CCRSG review and adoption is scheduled for the September CCRSG meeting.

2. Key interests expressed and topics of discussion

CCRSG members voiced a series of recurring themes in their comments that centered on ensuring that key interests are expressed in the text of the objectives. Among the key interests expressed were the importance of considering socioeconomic impacts of MPA designation, recognizing the role and value of commercial and recreational fishing, ensuring safe, convenient access for non-consumptive diving and education/research, conveying the range of habitat types to be represented, and clearly representing ecosystem functions to be protected.

Key areas of CCRSG discussion on the draft provisional regional objectives included the following:

- **Importance of simplicity.** Many participants offered comments intended to make the package of Regional Objectives more clear and brief.
- **Retaining opportunities for harvest of migratory and highly mobile species.** Participants spent considerable time drafting text for Goal 2, Objective 3 to convey a balanced approach to clarify situations in which migratory, highly mobile, or other species could be harvested in State Marine Parks or State Marine Conservation Areas.
- **Distinguishing between Regional Objectives and “design considerations.”** Participants discussed the difference between Regional Objectives and other “design considerations.” Initiative staff stressed that the Master Plan Framework specifically calls out the creation of such design considerations. Participants agreed that several of the draft provisional Objectives would better serve as design considerations. Participants considered design implications to be important components of MPA proposals and recommended that this be made clear in the adopted version of the Regional Objectives. There was a range of views regarding the weight that such considerations should carry in the design and evaluation of MPAs. Initiative staff planned to bring this topic to the BRTF.
- **Managing socioeconomic impacts.** Participants agreed that managing socioeconomic impacts was a design consideration that applied to all of the Regional Goals. Participants also agreed that this design consideration should include both minimizing long-term negative socioeconomic impacts as well as optimizing positive socioeconomic impacts.
- **Integration with existing state fishery management or recovery plans.** Participants requested that the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) provide policy guidance regarding the appropriate relationship between MLPA provisions and other state/federal resource management initiatives. In particular, participants want to know whether incorporating existing state fishery management or recovery plans should be at the level of a regional objective or a design consideration.
- **Proximity and access of MPAs for recreational, educational/research uses.** Participants discussed but did not come to resolution on a Regional Objective regarding proximity and accessibility of MPAs for recreational, educational, and research users. An ad hoc work group met during one of the breaks to address outstanding concerns. Participants expressed a willingness to continue these small group deliberations.

3. General support for the evolving draft provisional Regional Objectives

CCRSG members expressed the overall view that the draft provisional Regional Objectives are approaching a reasonable first cut, recognizing that more work is to be done. Further deliberation and final ratification is scheduled for the September CCRSG meeting.

C. Presentation on monitoring and evaluation outline

Mary Gleason (Initiative staff) reviewed the purpose of developing a monitoring and evaluation plan and described the iterative process by which monitoring and evaluation would contribute to improved management actions.

D. Science Advisory Team presentations

Members of the SAT made the following presentations to the CCRSG:

- 1) Presentation on marine ecosystems and ecosystem services (Dr. Mark Carr, University of California, Santa Cruz)
- 2) Presentation on marine habitats (Dr. Rick Starr, Marine Advisor for the University of California Sea Grant Extension Program for Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties)
- 3) Presentation on the use of economic data in the design and evaluation of MPAs (Dr. Linwood Pendleton, University of California, Los Angeles)

The presenters also addressed clarifying questions raised by CCRSG members.

E. Science questions and information requests

Michael DeLapa reminded CCRSG members of the procedure that has been developed for addressing to science questions and information requests. Heather Galindo and Carrie Kappel (SAT support staff) are the point persons for addressing ecosystem-based questions. Michael Weber (Initiative staff) is the point person for policy issues. Michael DeLapa reviewed the information requests already addressed and noted that the SAT is still working to respond to questions posed earlier by Rick Algert and John Wolfe. Initiative staff will produce a list of science questions coming out of the August CCRSG meeting for CCRSG member confirmation.

F. Status of Work Teams and ongoing data gathering efforts

1. Work team on socioeconomic information scoping

Kirk Sturm (Initiative staff) updated CCRSG members on the status of the Socioeconomic Work Team. The Work Team's purpose is to use a stakeholder driven process to identify and evaluate socioeconomic issues and data within the Central Coast Study Area.

The Work Team met on August 10, 2005 and approved a "Community Profile" data collection effort to aid the stakeholders with their decisions over the next few months. The Work Team also approved: key indicators, a list of planning and

visioning documents, locations, and two questions to ask each public entity along the coast within the study area.

Next steps for the Socioeconomic Work Team include:

- Kirk Sturm, by August 18, 2005, will draft a scope of work for the Community Profile; incorporating the stakeholder approved criteria.
- MLPA-I Team, by August 22, 2005, will review the scope of work for the Community Profile and determine the best way to complete the data collection efforts.
- Kirk Sturm, last week in August, provide the Work Team with an email update.
- Regional Stakeholders, October 5, 2005, will have the completed Community Profile.

The Work Team is not scheduled to meet in the near future.

2. Socioeconomic research

Charles Steinback (Ecotrust) provided an update on the socioeconomic research being performed by Ecotrust. He reviewed the sampling criteria, participation to date, and next step. Questions regarding the research project may be directed to charles@ecotrust.org.

G. Status of Appointment of CCRSG Alternate Members

MLPA Initiative staff reported that Glenn Richardson has been appointed as an alternate to Walter Schoebel.

H. Review and Adoption of Ground Rules to Guide Public Comment

CCRSG members reviewed and adopted a series of ground rules to guide public comment. These have been added to the complete set of ground rules for the project (see attached).

I. Public Comment

Five members of the public provided comments. In general, these comments supported the purpose of the MLPA and the efforts of the CCRSG.

IV. Next Steps and Schedule

Key next steps for the CCRSG include:

A. CCRSG tasks

1. CCRSG members to provide additional written comments on the second draft of the Regional Profile to Initiative staff at ccrsgcomment@resources.ca.gov by COB on August 16, 2005.
2. CCRSG members to validate accuracy of list of science questions captured from the August CCRSG meeting. [This list will be sent separately to CCRSG members.] Please send your responses to ccrsgcomment@resources.ca.gov. Initiative staff will then work with SST members to review, validate, and prioritize the sciences questions posed and to coordinate SAT responses.

B. CCRSG and Initiative staff shared tasks

1. Initiative staff will confer to consider how best to continue the development of Regional Objectives text. This may include reconvening various configurations of work teams.
2. Socioeconomic Work Team next steps include:
 - Kirk Sturm, by August 18, 2005, will draft a scope of work for the Community Profile; incorporating the stakeholder approved criteria.
 - MLPA-I Team, by August 22, 2005, will review the scope of work for the Community Profile and determine the best way to complete the data collection efforts.
 - Kirk Sturm, last week in August, provide the Work Team with an email update.
 - Regional Stakeholders, October 5, 2005, will have the completed Community Profile.

C. MLPA Initiative staff tasks

1. Initiative staff will develop a system to indicate level of review of Regional Profile.
2. Initiative staff will seek a clarification from DFG on the appropriate relationship between regional objectives text and plans for specific species, particularly the 19 finfish species and abalone.
3. Initiative staff to prepare key meeting materials for September CCRSG meeting. This will include a final version of the Regional Profile, revised draft provisional Regional Objectives, and preliminary materials to guide analysis of existing MPAs.
4. Initiative staff to send updated version of Ground Rules to CCRSG members.

The next meeting will take place on September 7-8, 2005 in Cambria, CA.

REVISED AGENDA
Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Meeting
September 7-8, 2005
Cambria Pines Lodge
2905 Burton Drive, Cambria, CA

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Review process for completing CCRSG work
2. Begin addressing outstanding issues of concern with a "TBD Bin" approach
3. Review, discuss, revise, and adopt provisional Regional Objectives
4. Begin evaluation of existing MPAs
5. Present final Regional Profile

MEETING AGENDA

Day 1 – September 7, 2005

Time	Agenda Item
9:30 AM	<i>Arrival, refreshments, greetings</i>
10:00 AM	Welcome, introductions, membership update, and agenda review
10:15 AM	Review process for completing CCRSG work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefing on guidance from BRTF • Ground rules reminder • Display boards
10:30 AM	Discuss key issues remaining from August CCRSG meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "TBD Bin" for addressing outstanding issues (Attachment 2, Handout 3) • Staff Analysis: Goals, Objectives and Design Considerations (Attachment 3)
11:30 AM	Public Comment
11:50 AM	<i>Lunch (on site)</i>
12:50 PM	Update on Final Regional Profile
1:00 PM	Review, discuss and revise draft provisional Regional Objectives (Attachment 4,5,6) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review process approach to this item; discuss timing of review process • Review guidance from DFG and MLPA Initiative team • Briefing on results of work team deliberations • Review, discuss, and revise provisional Regional Objectives • Take stock of next steps, as needed
3:15 PM	<i>Break</i>
3:30 PM	Review, discuss and revise draft provisional Regional Objectives Continued
5:00 PM	Updates and briefings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefing on communications issues – use of CCRSG list serve • Status of responses to science questions (Attachment 7) • Status of Socioeconomic work team • Status of fishers values project
5:30 PM	Conclude adoption of provisional Regional Objectives
6:00 PM	<i>Adjourn</i>
6:30 PM	<i>CCRSG Dinner at Brambles Dinner House</i>

Day 2 – September 8, 2005

Time	Agenda Item
8:00 AM	Continental breakfast
8:30 AM	Review agenda for Day 2 and Questions from Day 1
8:45 AM	Spatial data layers and MPA Decision Support Tool <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide overview of data layers • Demonstrate the tool
9:45 AM	DFG presentation on groundfish hotspots
10:00 AM	<i>Break</i>
10:15 AM	Present and discuss approach to preliminary analysis of existing MPAs (Handout 2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review evaluation matrix of physical characteristics and objectives • Discuss data gaps and need for additional input • CCRSG member comments on potential measures/benchmarks
12:00 PM	<i>Lunch (on site)</i>
1:00 PM	Collect CCRSG member information on individual MPAs (breakout by North and South)
2:15 PM	<i>Break</i>
2:30 PM	Collect CCRSG member information on individual MPAs (breakout by North and South)
4:00 PM	<i>Adjourn</i>

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

1. Revised Agenda
2. Process for addressing outstanding concerns – “TBD bin”
3. Staff analysis: goals, objectives and design considerations
4. Revised Draft Provisional Regional Objectives
5. Design considerations and implementation memo
6. Coordination of MLPA objectives and other management plans
7. Response to CCRSG science questions

LIST OF HANDOUTS

1. Meeting materials binder
2. Guidance-preliminary analysis of MPAs
3. MLPA staff recommendations regarding “TBD bin”

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: September 20, 2005

To: Members, MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – September 7-8, 2005 Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Staff

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes and Next Steps

On September 7-8, 2005, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Cambria, CA. The primary objectives for the meeting were to: 1) review process for completing CCRSG work, 2) begin addressing outstanding issues of concern with a “To be decided (TBD) Bin” approach, 3) review, discuss, revise, and adopt provisional Regional Objectives and Design and Implementation Considerations, 4) begin evaluation of existing MPAs, and 5) provide an update on the final Regional Profile.

Key outcomes from the meeting are as follows:

- Initiative staff reviewed for the CCRSG the process for completing CCRSG work.
- Initiative staff presented guidance on the relationship between regional objectives, design considerations, and implementation considerations. Staff will present this approach to the BRTF in late September.
- Initiative staff presented an approach for dealing with “TBD bin” issues. Staff also presented its recommendations regarding how to address such TBD issues as water quality, top end predators, safety, Pismo clams, and desalination plants.
- CCRSG members discussed, revised, and unanimously adopted a package for provisional regional goals, objectives and design and implementation considerations. MLPA Initiative staff will present this package to the Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) at its September meeting and request BRTF review and guidance.
- Staff will present a staff recommendation and also request guidance on two key issues resulting from the CCRSG deliberations on the package: socioeconomic considerations, and the inclusion of larval retention areas as a habitat type.
- Several new issues were added to the TBD bin, including the appropriate level for assessing MPA networks, the appropriate level for replicating marine habitats, and funding assurances.
- Initiative staff provided an update on spatial data layers and a decision support tool.
- Initiative staff presented a draft framework containing criteria for evaluating existing central coast MPAs. Stakeholders provided preliminary feedback.
- Participants split into northern and southern central coast breakout groups and provided both information and preliminary assessments of existing MPAs. Evaluation of existing MPAs will be a major topic of discussion at the October CCRSG meeting.

Key next steps are indicated in section IV below. The next CCRSG meeting will take place on October 5-6, 2005 in Monterey, CA.

I. Introduction and Outline

On September 7-8, 2005, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Cambria, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results. The memorandum is organized as follows:

- I. Introduction and Outline
- II. Workshop Objectives, Participants, and Materials
- III. Key Outcomes
 - A. Process for completing CCRSG work
 - B. Relationship between goals, objectives, and design considerations in MLPA planning
 - C. Creation of a "to be decided (TBD) bin" for addressing outstanding issues
 - D. Adoption of Provisional Regional Objectives and Design/Implementation Considerations
 - E. Science questions and information requests
 - F. Update on Regional Profile
 - G. Status of Work Teams and ongoing data gathering efforts
 - H. Update on Groundfish Hotspots and the MLPA Process
 - I. Update on Spatial Data Layers and the Decision Support Tool
 - J. Draft Framework for Evaluating Existing MPAs
 - K. Breakout Sessions – Preliminary feedback of Existing MPAs
 - L. Status of Appointment of CCRSG Alternate Members Public Comment
 - M. Public Comment
- IV. Next Steps

II. Meeting Objectives, Participants, and Materials

The primary objectives for the meeting were as follows:

- 1. Review process for completing CCRSG work
- 2. Begin addressing outstanding issues of concern with a "TBD Bin" approach
- 3. Review, discuss, revise, and adopt provisional Regional Objectives
- 4. Begin evaluation of existing MPAs
- 5. Provide update on final Regional Profile

Forty CCRSG primary and alternate members attended the meeting. Meg Caldwell participated as a representative of the Blue Ribbon Task Force. Doyle Hanan and Dean Wendt participated as Science Sub-Team (SST) members. Steve Barrager, SAT chair, also participated.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at:
<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meetings.html#centralcoast>.

III. Key Outcomes

A. Process for completing CCRSG work

John Kirlin and Michael DeLapa (MLPA Initiative staff) reviewed the CCRSG's overarching goals and main products as well as the anticipated process for completing the CCRSG's work. Staff presented display boards intended to help remind CCRSG members of this important information.

B. Relationship between goals, objectives, and design considerations in MLPA planning

Michael DeLapa presented a memorandum providing MLPA Initiative staff guidance on the relationship between goals, objectives, and design considerations in MLPA planning as mandated by the MLPA. Staff described the linkage of design and implementation considerations to the MLPA and provided illustrations for how particular issues (e.g., socio-economic considerations) would be handled as design considerations.

In discussions with the CCRSG, staff emphasized that both regional objectives and design and implementation considerations are to be considered in the evaluation and design of MPAs. Staff clarified that all design and implementation considerations need not apply to all objectives. Staff also stressed that while design considerations are especially important in the design phase of MPAs, some design considerations (e.g., socio-economic impacts) will also be considered throughout the monitoring and evaluation.

Staff will present this approach to the BRTF at their September 28-29, 2005 meeting. Initiative staff invited CCRSG members to send additional written comments on this proposed approach to CCRSG_Comments@resources.ca.gov by COB, September 14, 2005.

C. Creation of a “To be decided (TBD) bin” for addressing outstanding issues

Michael Weber (MLPA Initiative staff) described the approach by which outstanding (i.e., “to be decided”) issues will be addressed in the CCRSG process.

1. Approach for dealing with TBD bin issues

Initiative staff proposed the following approach for dealing with TBD issues:

- a. During CCRSG meetings, Initiative staff will strive to capture and record concerns and issues appropriate inclusion in the TBD bin as they are raised during CCRSG deliberations.
- b. Initiative staff will then determine those items that are appropriately addressed by MLPA Initiative staff and, as necessary, the SAT, and those that need to be forwarded to the BRTF for their consideration and guidance.

- c. For those issues that can most appropriately be addressed by staff, Initiative staff will provide recommendations regarding how the CCRSG may most effectively address the TBD issues.
- d. For appropriate issues, Initiative staff will agendaize BRTF review and deliberation. The BRTF will offer its guidance on these issues, which staff will report to the CCRSG.
- e. Initiative staff and the CCRSG will take this guidance into account in completing the various tasks of CCRSG.

2. TBD issues addressed

Initiative staff presented a memo providing staff recommendations for addressing the following TBD issues: 1) addressing the effect of impaired water quality on MPAs, 2) addressing the risks to public safety from MPA design proposals, 3) addressing the impacts of top end predators on MPAs (including the effects on the size, abundance, and biodiversity of marine life caused by pinniped predation), 4) restoring Pismo clam populations, and 5) considering the potential impact of desalination plants as related to the design of MPAs.

For each item, Initiative staff described the issue; related it to the MLPA, the Master Plan Framework (MPF), or other relevant law or documents; and provided a recommendation for how the particular issues should be addressed within the context of CCRSG efforts.

Initiative staff will present this proposed approach for addressing TBD bin issues to the BRTF at their September 28-29, 2005 meeting. Initiative staff invited CCRSG members to send additional written comments on this proposed approach to CCRSG_Comments@resources.ca.gov by COB, September 14, 2005.

3. New TBD issues to be addressed

During the discussion of provisional regional objectives and design and implementation considerations, CCRSG members raised several issues that were added to the TBD bin. These include:

- Should replication as defined in the MLPA be applied and achieved within the Central Coast study region or at the level of a biogeographical region, across several study regions?
- Should nursery areas be included as a habitat type?
- How should implementation of new MPAs be tied to available funding for monitoring, management and enforcement?
- Should the CCRSG pursue alternatives of MPAs within the central coast study region that function as a network or as a component of a statewide network?

Initiative staff will address these TBD issues per the process outlined in section III.C.1 above.

D. Adoption of Provisional Regional Objectives and Design/Implementation Considerations

CCRSG members engaged in intensive and comprehensive review and discussion of draft provisional regional objectives and design and implementation considerations. On Day 2, CCRSG members unanimously adopted a package of provisional regional objectives, design considerations, and implementation considerations to guide future development of proposals of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in the central coast study region.

Appendix 1 of the Goals, Objectives, and Design and Implementation Considerations Report presents the options considered and the results of straw voting conducted at the September CCRSG meeting. For each straw vote (there were approximately 40 in all), this document indicates both the options considered and the results of the voting (in italics). This report is available at: <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meetings.html#brtf>.

1. Process for assessing CCRSG support of provisional regional objectives and design and implementation considerations

In developing the text of the final package, CCRSG members and Initiative staff proceeded through the following steps:

- CCRSG members reviewed the current version of draft text.
- CCRSG members reviewed the derivation and rationale for the text.
- CCRSG members received commentary from policy advisors and SAT members.
- Staff invited comment from CCRSG members.
- CCRSG arrived at stable text configurations.
- Staff framed straw votes.

MLPA Initiative facilitators used several straw voting techniques to help gauge CCRSG member support for both individual draft regional objectives, design considerations, and implementation considerations and the complete package. Participants eligible to take part in the straw voting included primary CCRSG members or, in cases where primary members were not present, their designated alternates.

To help gauge support for individual objectives or design/implementation considerations or to help choose between two options, facilitators recapped key text formulations in progress and then most often framed the voting choices in one of the following main ways:

- “Who cannot live with” the proposed text? or
- “Who prefers option A? Who prefers option B?”

In the September CCRSG meeting, staff relied most heavily on the “who cannot live with this text” formulation to frame straw votes. Staff made this wording choice as a practical application of the CCRSG’s ground rule on decision rules. For three highly contested objectives under goal 3, the facilitators composed a straw ballot and asked participants to rank the options under each objective in order of preference (“1” for most preferred, “2” for second most preferred, etc.). This produced a distribution of “points” in which the option with the lowest total number of “points” was considered as the most preferred, while that with the largest sum represented the choice least preferred for each objective.

To adopt the suite of objectives, design considerations, and implementation considerations, the facilitators asked CCRSG members whether or not they could support the entire package. In this case, 28 members indicated that they “could support the package”; zero indicated that they could not.

2. Key issues addressed; guidance sought from BRTF

CCRSG members addressed all of the draft provisional regional objectives and design and implementation considerations and had far ranging discussions on several in particular. In the straw voting, the CCRSG members showed strong support for most of the proposed provisional regional objectives and design and implementation considerations. The CCRSG was split, however, on two issues in particular:

- Whether socioeconomic considerations should be included as a design consideration or an objective under goal 2.
- Whether larval retention areas should be included as a habitat type in goal 4, objective 1.

CCRSG members requested specific guidance from the Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) on these two issues.

E. Science questions and information requests

Initiative staff will produce a list of science questions coming out of the September CCRSG meeting for CCRSG member confirmation. Initiative staff will then work with the Science Advisory Team (SAT) to prepare responses. These will be presented at the October CCRSG meeting.

F. Update on Regional Profile

Initiative staff reported that a final version of the Regional Profile will be posted on September 16, 2005. Staff will present the Regional Profile to the BRTF as an informational item at the BRTF’s September 28-29 meeting.

Initiative staff reiterated that the Regional Profile is a “living document” and will continue to be revised as additional information is received.

G. Status of Work Teams and ongoing data gathering efforts

1. Socioeconomic information scoping

John Kirlin and Michael DaLapa approved the Stakeholder generated Scope of Work for the Community Profile data collection effort. A draft Community Profile Report is scheduled to be provided to the Socio-Economic Work Team in early October with the Final Report due mid-October.

H. Update on Groundfish Hotspots and the MLPA Process

John Ugoretz (California Department of Fish and Game) described a potential new approach to groundfish management being pursued by the Pacific Fishery Management Council. He described a recent data collection effort aimed at identifying areas with high or low probability of catching species of concern. One aim of this effort is to permit some additional fishing for groundfish in the present Rockfish Conservation Area in low probability areas. This process may integrate well with the MLPA process, as it defines specific areas of concern to council management. John used canary rockfish as an example of the type of data being collected, noting that what was shown was draft and that this method could be applied to other species as well. John indicated that a draft analysis will be available to the CCRSG for consideration in the October timeframe.

Several CCRSG members expressed the view that this study, and the potential refinement of the regulatory regime that could result from it, was welcome news. Other CCRSG members noted that there are additional species of interest for which such a fine-grained analysis would be very constructive step in crafting better informed resource management. John reiterated that what was being shown at this meeting was a preliminary draft and that a more full description of the data and applicability to the MLPA process would be available in October.

I. Update on Spatial Data Layers and the Decision Support Tool

1. Spatial data layers

Staff provided a list of the 130 spatial data layers compiled by MLPA, CDFG, and MBNMS staff that are available for MPA planning. The data layers vary in quality and suitability for planning. Staff is developing a data review process w/ the SAT to provide guidance to stakeholders on how best to use the data. This information will appear on revised versions of the data layer list. CCRSG members provided preliminary feedback on the data layers. Several stakeholders, for instance, requested that a latitude/longitude layer be added. These data layers may be viewed by the public at the Internet Mapping Service site.

2. Decision Support Tool

Mary Gleason reported that staff has been working with a contractor to develop a web-based MPA decision support tool. A preview of the tool was provided. The tool allows users to view data layers, draw candidate MPAs, and generate a report on specific data layers in candidate MPA(s). Staff and stakeholders requested that a standard means of creating filenames for proposed MPAs be established and that a “point of contact” for addressing questions from stakeholders be identified.

At the October CCRSG meeting, stakeholders will receive a tutorial for the tool and then split up into workstations with the assistance of support staff. Staff will develop a process by which “lines on the map” will be drawn. Mary requested that CCRSG members prepare for the October meeting by taking the following steps:

- a. Visit the Internet Mapping Site (IMS) to become familiar with the regional geography and the strengths and limitations of the data sets. The site address is: <http://maps.msi.ucsb.edu/mlpa>.
- b. Come to the next meeting prepared to interact with spatial data and maps.
- c. Consider issues of data quality when using spatial data to inform identification of MPA alternatives.

J. Draft Framework for Evaluating Existing MPAs

Initiative staff presented a draft framework containing criteria for evaluating existing central coast MPAs. CCRSG and SAT members provided initial feedback on the framework. Some stakeholders commented on the need for improved indicators. Others commented that better data are needed in order to make the draft criteria effective. A few suggested that the framework be expanded to include examination of other closures (e.g., Diablo Canyon, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and those due to fishery laws and regulations). CCRSG members Steve Scheiblauber and Rick Algert agreed to provide staff with a list of such closures by September 14, 2005.

Participants also briefly considered the pros and cons of evaluating existing MPAs from the ground up (i.e., tied to each of the criteria) versus evaluating them from the top-down (where evaluation proposals are made and then the criteria are examined to see if they support the proposal or not). The general conclusion from this discussion was that drawing upon both approaches and reviewing existing MPAs sooner rather than later would be a constructive step and a way to make good use of CCRSG members' time at the meeting.

Initiative staff indicated that a key next step in this effort is to get stakeholder feedback on the draft indicators (listed in the matrix as “proposed benchmark/metric”). Staff requested that CCRSG members provide written comment on the criteria and the indicators in particular by September 14, 2005. Participants noted that different indicators may be needed depending on whether the intent is to: 1) evaluate existing MPAs and other management, 2) analyze new MPA proposals,

or 3) assess long term monitoring. Staff noted that the current emphasis is on the first two purposes.

K. Breakout Sessions – Preliminary feedback of Existing MPAs

Initiative staff organized participants into two breakout sessions: one focused on the northern central coast study region, and the other focused on the southern central coast study region. The southern group had a broad representation of stakeholder interests. The northern group lacked representation from commercial fishing interests.

The breakout sessions had two main purposes. The first was to solicit additional stakeholder information regarding existing MPAs. Staff asked stakeholders to provide input on data sheets. This information concerns familiarity with particular habitat types, species of concerns, other species of interest, and human use patterns. The second was to provide preliminary feedback on the existing central coast MPAs.

1. Northern breakout group

John Ugoretz and Kirk Sturm led the northern Stakeholders in a break out session to begin evaluating the six existing MPAs and one special closure between Pigeon Point and Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park. Fifteen CCRSG members participated.

- a. Scan of stakeholder knowledge/input: The Stakeholders were provided a one page information sheet that could be used to evaluate an MPA. The Stakeholders provided 26 information sheets regarding the 6 MPAs and one special closure in the north.
- b. Preliminary stakeholder evaluation. The Stakeholders used a Green (contributes to achieving regional objectives/consideration), Yellow (with modifications, may contribute), Red (does not appear to contribute) evaluation tool regarding the six northern MPAs and one special closure. Nearly all of the areas were rated Green or Yellow. One area in which stakeholders did not provide feedback was Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Marine Conservation Area. Stakeholders indicated that they did not know enough about this MPA to evaluate it. Stakeholders also provided their thoughts on what it would take to make the Yellow MPAs Green. Key changes suggested included: increase in size of MPA, regulations, increase in protection of some finfish, and access to the ocean.

2. Southern breakout group

Mary Gleason, Don Maruska, and Paul Reilly led the southern Stakeholders in a break out session to begin evaluating the six existing MPAs between Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park and Point Conception. Ten CCRSG members participated.

- a. Scan of stakeholder knowledge/input: At least a couple of stakeholders could provide input on habitats or species present for every southern MPA.
- b. Preliminary stakeholder evaluation. Stakeholders viewed the Pismo SMCA as too small to be effective and could potentially be deleted. Of the three other SMCAs focused on the protection of Pismo clams, Morro Beach was considered the best to retain because of the adjacent Montana de Oro State Park and the lack of sewage or power plant outfalls; Pismo-Oceano and Atascadero SMCAs were considered less effective. Both Big Creek and Vandenberg SMRs were viewed as being potentially improved by boundary changes that incorporated more representative habitats.

L. Status of Appointment of CCRSG Alternate Members

MLPA Initiative staff reported that Trudi O'Brien was named as a new alternate for Jeremiah O'Brien. Trudi takes the place of Bill Diller.

M. Public Comment

Two members of the public provided comments. In general, these comments supported the purpose of the MLPA, the role of public involvement in the process, and the progress and efforts of the CCRSG.

IV. Next Steps and Schedule

Key next steps for the CCRSG include:

A. CCRSG tasks

1. CCRSG members to provide additional written comments on the following documents by COB on September 14, 2005. Please send comments to Initiative staff at ccrsgcomment@resources.ca.gov.
 - Adopted provisional regional goals, objectives, and design and implementation considerations.
 - Staff guidance on the relationship between regional goals and design and implementation considerations.
 - Staff analysis of TBD bin issues (e.g., water quality, top end predators, safety, Pismo clams, desalination plants).
 - Science questions related to the Central Coast project.
 - Draft framework for evaluating MPAs, including preliminary evaluation criteria, indicators, evaluation matrix, and other information relevant to the evaluation of existing MPAs.
 - CCRSG members Steve Scheiblauber and Rick Algert agreed to provide staff with a list of other types of closures (e.g., Diablo Canyon, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and those due to fishery laws and regulations) that could be added to the framework.

- Information on existing MPAs.
2. CCRSG members will prepare to use the Decision Support Tool at the October CCRSG meeting by taking the following steps:
 - Visit the Internet Mapping Site (IMS) to become familiar with the regional geography and the strengths and limitations of the data sets. The address is: <http://maps.msi.ucsb.edu/mlpa>.
 - Come to the next meeting prepared to interact with spatial data and maps.
 - Consider issues of data quality when using spatial data to inform identification of MPA alternatives.

B. MLPA Initiative staff tasks

1. Initiative staff to present the adopted package of provisional regional goals, objectives, and design and implementation considerations to the BRTF. Initiative staff to also seek guidance from the BRTF on the following issues:
 - Whether socioeconomic considerations should be included as a design consideration or an objective under goal 2.
 - Whether larval retention areas should be included as a habitat type in goal 4, objective 1.
2. Initiative staff to coordinate with the SAT and the BRTF, as appropriate, to provide guidance on the following new TBD bin issues:
 - Should replication of habitats be achieved at the level of the biogeographical region or the study region?
 - Should nursery areas be included as a habitat type?
 - How should implementation of new MPAs be tied to available funding for monitoring, management and enforcement?
 - Should the CCRSG pursue achieving a “network” of MPAs at the level of the region or at the level of the state?
3. Initiative staff to prepare key meeting materials for October CCRSG meeting. This will include the final Regional Profile, updated spatial data layers, a completed decision analysis tool, and a process to guide the development of draft CCRSG member MPA proposals.

The next meeting will be convened on October 5-6, 2005 in Monterey.

REVISED AGENDA
Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Meeting
October 5-6, 2005
The Beach Resort Monterey
2600 Sand Dunes Drive, Monterey, CA

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Receive report back from BRTF on key guidance
2. Demonstrate IMMSG support tool
3. Provide overview of approach for evaluating and proposing MPAs
4. Review preliminary evaluation of existing MPAs
5. Begin producing inventory of candidate MPAs, including initial evaluation and critique

MEETING AGENDA

Day 1 – October 5, 2005

Time	Agenda Item
9:30 AM	<i>Arrival, refreshments, greetings</i>
10:00 AM	Welcome, introductions, and agenda review
10:15 AM	Updates and briefings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report back from BRTF and SAT meetings • Report on TBD bin items (Attachment 2) • Ground rules updates and reminders • Other updates
10:40 AM	Present and discuss proposed process approach for evaluating existing MPAs, proposing new MPA concepts, and assessing proposed MPA concepts
11:00 AM	Module 1: Demonstration of IMMSG tool (Big Creek example)
12:00 PM	Public Comment
12:20 PM	<i>Lunch (on site)</i>
1:20 PM	CDFG update on groundfish hotspots
1:50 PM	Other updates and briefings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science questions (Attachment 3) • Update on website to access science literature • Other updates
2:15 PM	Present preliminary evaluation of existing central coast MPAs and habitat gap analysis (Attachments 4)
3:15 PM	<i>Break</i>
3:30 PM	Module 2 (North/South breakout groups): Discuss potential modifications to existing MPAs (Attachments 4-5)
5:00 PM	Plenary: Report back from breakouts on Module 2
5:45 PM	<i>Adjourn</i>
6:30 PM	CCRSF Dinner - El Torito (600 Cannery Row, Monterey) MLPA Science Advisory Team (SAT) member presentations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population persistence (or the importance of big, old rockfish). Dr. Louis Botsford, Univ. of California, Davis • Larval dispersal and recruitment. Dr. Mark Carr, Univ. of California, Santa Cruz • Adult movement and neighborhoods. Dr. Rick Starr, California State University, Monterey Bay

Day 2 – October 6, 2005

Time	Agenda Item
8:00 AM	<i>Continental breakfast</i>
8:30 AM	Review agenda for Day 2 and Questions from Day 1
8:45 AM	Module 3 (four breakout groups): Brainstorm and begin building an inventory of Candidate MPA Concepts, including identifying issues of concern and questions to answer (Attachments 4-5)
10:30 AM	<i>Break</i>
10:45 AM	Module 3: Brainstorm and begin building an inventory of Candidate MPA Concepts (cont.)
12:00 PM	<i>Lunch (on site)</i>
1:00 PM	Module 3: Brainstorm and begin building an inventory of Candidate MPA Concepts (cont.)
2:15 PM	<i>Break</i>
2:30 PM	Module 4 (plenary): Outline next steps to synthesize, refine and evaluate initial Candidate MPA Concepts
3:30 PM	Wrap up and next steps
4:00 PM	<i>Adjourn</i>

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

1. Revised Agenda
2. Memorandum on TBD Bin Items
3. Response to CCRSG science questions
4. Preliminary Evaluation of Existing Central Coast MPAs (including appendices)
5. BRTF Revised Adopted Provisional Regional Goals and Objectives Package

LIST OF HANDOUTS

1. Central Coast Regional Profile – Final
2. IMMSG Tool Tutorial
3. Process Guidelines MPA Brainstorming Activity
4. Species Movements and Implications for Marine Protected Area (MPA) Network Design
5. Larvae, Dispersal, and MPAs
6. Sustainability & Age Structure in Marine Population

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: October 21, 2005

To: Members, MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – October 5-6, 2005 Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Staff

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On October 5-6, 2005, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Monterey, CA. The primary objectives for the meeting were to: 1) receive report back from the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) on key guidance; 2) demonstrate the MPA decision support tool (MPA-DST); 3) provide an overview of the process approach for evaluating and proposing MPAs; 4) review the preliminary evaluation of existing MPAs and habitat gap analysis; and 5) begin producing an inventory of candidate MPAs, including initial evaluation and critique.

Key outcomes from the meeting are as follows:

- MLPA Initiative staff distributed copies of the updated regional profile (v.3.0).
- Initiative staff briefed the CCRSG on the results of the September BRTF meeting.
- Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) members conducted three informational presentations.
- Department of Fish and Game staff updated the CCRSG on current work on groundfish hotspots.
- Initiative staff provided an overview and demonstration of the MPA-DST
- Initiative staff presented a draft evaluation and habitat gap analysis of existing central coast MPAs.
- CCRSG members began building an inventory of candidate MPA concepts.
 - CCRSG members initiated discussions on refining existing MPAs.
 - CCRSG members initiated development of new candidate MPA concepts and provided initial commentary, critique, and refinement.
- Initiative staff outlined next steps in developing candidate MPA concepts.

Key next steps are indicated in section IV below. The next CCRSG meeting will take place on November 9-10, 2005 in Cambria, CA.

I. Introduction and Outline

On October 5-6, 2005, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Monterey, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results. The memorandum is organized as follows:

- I. Introduction and Outline
- II. Workshop Objectives, Participants, and Materials
- III. Key Outcomes
 - A. Distribution of updated regional profile
 - B. Report back from MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) meeting
 - C. Update on "TBD Bin" items
 - D. Overview and demonstration of MPA decision support tool (Module 1)
 - E. Update on groundfish hotspots and the MLPA process
 - F. Update on external MPA proposals
 - G. Science questions and information requests
 - H. Project website and links to scientific information
 - I. Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) presentations
 - J. Evaluation and gap analysis of existing central coast MPAs
 - K. Breakout group (north/south) discussions—Building an inventory of candidate MPA concepts (Modules 2 and 3)
 - L. Public comment
- IV. Next Steps

II. Meeting Objectives, Participants, and Materials

The primary objectives for the meeting were as follows:

1. Receive report back from the BRTF on key guidance
2. Demonstrate MPA decision support tool (MPA-DST)
3. Provide an overview of the process approach for evaluating and proposing MPAs
4. Review the preliminary evaluation and habitat gap analysis of existing MPAs
5. Begin producing an inventory of candidate MPA concepts, including initial evaluation and critique

Forty-seven CCRSG primary and alternate members attended the meeting. Doyle Hanan, Mark Carr, Rick Starr, and Louis Botsford participated as Central Coast Science Sub-Team (SST) members. Steve Barrager, SAT chair, also participated. No one was in attendance from the BRTF.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at:
<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meetings.html#centralcoast>.

III. Key Outcomes

A. Distribution of updated regional profile

Initiative staff distributed copies of the updated Regional Profile of the Central Coast Study Region (v.3.0, dated September 19, 2005) to CCRSG members.

B. Report back from BRTF meeting

John Kirlin (MLPA Initiative staff) reported that the BRTF, at its September 28, 2005 meeting, approved the package of Regional Goals, Objectives, and Design and Implementation Considerations sent to it by the CCRSG with two key changes.

1. The BRTF chose to express the text on socio-economic impacts as an objective under Goal 5. The new Goal 5, Objective 1 reads: “Minimize negative socio-economic impacts and optimize positive socio-economic impacts for all users, to the extent possible, and if consistent with the Marine Life Protection Act and its goals and guidelines.”
2. The BRTF deleted the references to “upwelling centers” and “larval retention areas” in Goal 4, Objective 1. The restated objective now reads: “Include within MPAs the following habitat types: estuaries, heads of submarine canyons, and pinnacles.”

C. Update on “TBD Bin” items

Michael Weber (MLPA Initiative staff) presented a staff analysis on the issue of habitat replication. Staff recommended that habitat replication, as defined in the MLPA, be applied on a biogeographic region rather than within a study region, consistent with the requirements of the MLPA and the MLPA Master Plan Framework (MPF). If the packages of MPAs developed in the central coast do not meet the requirements for replicate habitats, this requirement would be shifted to future study regions to the north that are in the same bioregion. However, the CCRSG should consider the requirement for habitat replication as it develops alternative packages of MPAs and seek to meet the requirement where possible.

Several CCRSG members expressed the concern that the BRTF had little time to discuss the TBD bin items at the September BRTF meeting. MLPA Initiative staff responded that while in-meeting deliberation was relatively brief, the BRTF members had read and considered the TBD bin issues.

D. Overview and demonstration of MPA-DST (Module 1)

Mary Gleason (MLPA Initiative staff), along with Brad Pfefferle and Bob Sherwood of IM Systems Group, Inc. (IMSG), provided an overview and demonstration of the decision support tool developed by IMSG. The purpose of the MPA-DST is to provide CCRSG members with the capacity to delineate candidate MPA concepts and evaluate what habitats or other areas of interest are captured within candidate MPAs or arrays of MPAs.

Mary briefly described a meeting handout containing a tutorial for assisting CCRSG members to become more comfortable with the MPA-DST. Mary also emphasized that CCRSG member candidate MPA concepts developed using the tool will remain private until “published”, at which point they can be viewed by other CCRSG members.

MLPA Initiative staff will email CCRSG members the website URL for accessing the tool, along with CCRSG member usernames and passwords, by October 10, 2005.

Initiative staff reminded stakeholders that the reports from the MPA-DST are only as good as the underlying spatial data layers selected, noting that some data layers are more accurate than others. Staff also pointed out that most of the socioeconomic data on fisheries still needs to be added. Staff invited CCRSG members to continue incorporating local knowledge into their deliberations and to not rely solely on the MPA-DST.

CCRSG members made several comments regarding the decision support tool:

- Participants requested that a function be added to show latitude and longitude and allow candidate MPAs to be snapped to latitude and longitude.
- Participants requested that depth contours also be provided in fathoms.

E. Update on groundfish hotspots and the MLPA process

John Ugoretz and Deb Wilson-Vandenberg (California Department of Fish and Game—DFG) provided an update on recent efforts by the DFG and the Pacific Fishery Management Council to identify areas with a high probability of take and the status of overfished species within established rockfish conservation areas. The agencies are exploring the possibility of providing for more fishing in some of these areas (e.g., during additional months of the year, or at different depths). The agencies are also exploring the potential benefits of overlapping key rockfish hotspots with MPAs.

CCRSG members commented that these agencies need to collect data on fishing effort to help contextualize areas of high take. Participants also discussed the relationship between MPAs and optimal yield. DFG staff will be contacting the Pacific Fishery Management Council to discuss how to best coordinate efforts and to determine how and if total allowable catch allocations would change in response to establishing MPAs.

F. Update on external MPA proposals

John Kirlin stated that the deadline for submitting external MPA proposals is October 15, 2005. These proposals must adhere to the guidelines established in the MPF. The CCRSG will be asked to take these external proposals into consideration as part of its deliberations.

G. Science questions and information requests

Mike Weber presented the SAT responses to CCRSG questions on the topics of 1) larval retention areas and 2) nursery habitats. The SAT recommended that larval retention areas not be included in the list of habitats to be replicated. The SAT also recommended that nursery areas, which are often captured by other habitats, be considered on a case-by-case basis.

H. Project website and links to scientific information

Initiative staff reminded CCRSG members of the existence of an MLPA Initiative website that lists references to pertinent scientific literature. The website may be accessed at: <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/science1.html> and is updated periodically. CCRSG members are invited to recommend additional references and should direct such inquiries to John Ugoretz.

I. Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) presentations

Members of the SAT made the following dinnertime presentations to the CCRSG:

1. *Sustainability and age structure in marine populations (Dr. Loo Botsford, University of California, Davis).*
2. *Larval dispersal and recruitment (Dr. Mark Carr, University of California, Santa Cruz).*
3. *Movements of marine species relative to MPAs (Dr. Rick Starr, Marine Advisor for the University of California Sea Grant Extension Program for Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties).*

CCRSG members posed, and the presenters addressed, several clarifying questions. In particular, several participants pointed out that fishing is not the only cause for the shortening of age structures of populations.

Summaries of the SAT member presentations may be found on the MLPA website at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meeting_100505.html.

J. Evaluation and gap analysis of existing central coast MPAs

Mary Gleason and John Ugoretz presented MLPA Initiative staff's draft evaluation and gap analysis of existing central coast MPAs. They noted that the draft document will be revised per CCRSG member input. CCRSG comments are requested in writing by October 15, 2005. Comments should be sent to mplacomments@resources.ca.gov.

Among the general findings of the draft evaluation and gap analysis are the following:

- The existing array of MPAs along the central coast does not include representation of all habitat types and provides little in the way of ecosystem protection or coherent management.
- There is currently little protection of deep-water habitats, eelgrass, canyons, or pinnacles in the central coast study region.
- Estuarine habitat is protected in the northern part of the central coast study region but not in the southern part.
- The current data regarding distribution of pinnacles and nearshore rocky reefs is relatively poor.
- There are large gaps between MPAs in the south (Morro Bay to Big Creek) and the north (Elkhorn Slough to beyond Pigeon Pt.).

CCRSG members offered a variety of comments on the draft evaluation and gap analysis document. These included:

- Participants queried staff about the measurability of particular regional objectives.
- Participants suggested that the use of species “presence” is a crude measure and doesn’t really address whether the size of the MPA is sufficient for that species.
- Participants recommended including recent research by Dr. John Stevens (Cal Poly San Luis Obispo) on the performance of MPAs.
- Participants questioned the accuracy of several of the staff analysis findings regarding whether certain objectives are being met by existing MPAs and other regulatory measures.
- Participants suggested disaggregating between specific species and types of MPAs with regard to the “spacing guidelines”; spacing between 2 reserves that don’t both have rockfish, for example, is not relevant.

K. Breakout group discussions—Building an inventory of candidate MPA concepts (Modules 2 and 3)

1. Two-step process

CCRSG members participated in a two-step process to begin building an inventory of possible candidate MPA concepts. Participants acknowledged that the next steps of evaluating the candidate MPA concepts and beginning to think about possible MPA packages would take place following the October CCRSG meeting.

On Day 1, CCRSG members broke out into two groups (one North and one South) to begin discussing potential modifications to existing MPAs. On Day 2, CCRSG members broke out into four groups (two north and two south) to continue the Day 1 discussions and to begin exploring possible new MPAs. Participants were asked to approach this process in the spirit of “inventing without committing.”

When proposing candidate MPA concepts, participants were asked to describe the habitats and species protected as well as the regional goals, objectives, and design considerations achieved. Participants were also asked to provide preliminary feedback and critique on the candidate MPA concepts being proposed.

Participants prepared data forms detailing the specifics and rationales for most of the candidate MPA concepts discussed. During the meeting, MLPA Initiative staff began entering into the MPA-DST the candidate MPA concepts proposed.

On the whole, participants found the MPA-DST to be useful. It did take some time for CCRSG members to get familiar with its functionality. As well, it took some time to delineate the respective boundary polygons.

2. North and south breakout groups

a. Northern breakout groups

On Day 1, participants discussed possible modifications to the following existing MPAs in the northern part of the study area: Ano Nuevo special closure, Elkhorn Slough SMR, Hopkins SMR, Pacific Grove SMCA, Carmel Bay SMCA, and Point Lobos SMR. Participants discussed the options of retaining the existing MPAs, removing them, or modifying them by changing the MPA boundaries, changing the MPA classification, or changing the regulations that apply.

On Day 2, participants proposed new candidate MPA concepts intended to address the gap analysis and better achieve regional goals and objectives. Key themes from Day 2 discussions include the following:

- Several participants had specific candidate MPA concepts they wished to advance.
- Participants discussed approximately 25-30 potential new MPAs for the northern part of the central coast study area.
- Participants proposed multiple possible candidate MPA concepts for certain geographic regions (especially near the Monterey peninsula).
- Some candidate MPA concepts were variants of others. Other candidate concepts were linked to the proposed revisions to existing MPAs.
- In some instances, via the process of providing critical feedback, participants co-created or revised candidate MPA concepts on the spot.
- Participant comments on candidate MPA concepts typically focused on impacts on particular user groups (especially commercial fishing, recreational fishing, and diving).

b. Southern breakout group

On Day 1, much of the discussion among southern breakout group participants focused on the review of existing MPAs and the contents of the data gaps. The MPAs under discussion included: Julie Pfeiffer Burns SMCA, Big Creek SMR, Atascadero Beach SMCA, Morro Beach SMCA, Pismo SMCA, Pismo-Oceano SMCA, and Vandenberg SMR. Participants also

discussed the impacts of other management measures, such as the Diablo Canyon Exclusion Zone, the Vandenberg safety zones, and regulations like the rockfish conservation areas.

The discussion of existing MPAs was productively carried forward into a broader exploration of potential new candidate MPA concepts on Day 2. Among the recurring themes were the following:

- Several CCRSG members had concepts they wished to advance. Some were quite specific; others were more general.
- Participants discussed approximately 40-45 potential new MPAs for the northern part of the central coast study area.
- There may be an inherent tradeoff between nuanced delineation of MPAs and ease of enforcement. While simple rectangles are easier to enforce, they may generate unintended regulation of uses.
- In several instances, proposers of candidate MPA concepts found that they were able to refine concepts in such a way as to integrate the interests of other CCRSG users.
- Potential socioeconomic impacts on salmon trolling, spot prawns and groundfish fishing were noted for several potential MPAs.
- Some, but not all, gaps have been potentially addressed with the concept MPAs.

3. Loading into the MPA-DST

MLPA Initiative staff made efforts to load all of the candidate MPA concepts offered (both modifications to existing MPAs and proposed new MPAs) into the MPA-DST. CCRSG members may access these at <http://www.mpademo.imsq.com>. MLPA Initiative staff will provide CCRSG members with usernames and passwords.

L. Public comment

Ten members of the public provided comments. Some spoke in support of MPAs generally as a tool for protecting marine habitat and species. Others commented on the effectiveness of existing MPAs and recommended specific modifications. Several summarized new candidate MPA concepts that they intend to submit to MLPA Initiative staff and indicated their interest in discussing these with CCRSG members. Still others expressed interest in submitting proposals; some indicated an interest in co-developing candidate MPA concepts with CCRSG members.

IV. Next Steps and Schedule

A. Near-term next steps

Near-term next steps to prepare for the November 9-10, 2005 CCRSG meeting include:

1. Staff to compile full inventory of candidate MPA concepts (including proposed modifications of existing MPAs) along with preliminary critiques and data requests offered at October CCRSG meeting.
2. MLPA Initiative staff to email website URL for accessing the decision support tool, along with CCRSG member usernames and passwords, to CCRSG members by October 10, 2005.
3. CCRSG members to propose additional or refined candidate MPA concepts through October 15, 2005 so these can be added to the preparatory materials for the November CCRSG meeting. [Note: CCRSG members can propose additional MPA concepts after this date as well.]
4. Drawing on the preliminary critique offered by CCRSG members and staff's best professional judgment, staff to conduct preliminary analysis of candidate MPA concepts (including proposed modifications of existing MPAs). This will include:
 - Staff to sort MPA concepts.
 - Staff to consolidate MPA concepts to the extent that they are redundant or overlap significantly.
 - Staff to note general areas of agreement and disagreement.
 - Staff to provide GIS analysis of habitats captured.
5. Staff to revise Evaluation of Existing Central Coast MPAs and gap analysis.
6. CCRSG to participate in work sessions to be organized in the north (1 in Monterey) and south (1 in San Luis Obispo) on October 20, 2005. The purpose of the work sessions is to give CCRSG members: a) more experience working with the MPA-DST, and b) the opportunity to revise/refine their candidate MPA concepts based on October CCRSG meeting discussions.
7. Small, cross-interest groups of CCRSG members wishing to develop or refine candidate MPA concepts, but who may benefit from technical assistance in using the MPA-DST, may request staff support. Requests should be sent to Michael DeLapa.
8. Staff to distribute a summary of its preliminary analysis to CCRSG members as part of the November CCRSG meeting materials package.
9. CCRSG to develop more fully formed and refined candidate MPA concepts for discussion at the November CCRSG meeting

B. Longer-term next steps

1. November CCRSG meeting (November 9-10, 2005 in Cambria)
 - a. CCRSG to propose and discuss refined MPA concepts (including revised modifications to existing MPAs).

- b. CCRSG to compare refined MPA concepts with habitat gap analysis and analyze the extent to which they contribute to regional goals, objectives, design considerations, and MPF criteria.
 - c. CCRSG to enter refined MPA concepts into preliminary alternative packages of MPAs.
 - d. CCRSG to begin deliberating on preliminary alternative packages.
2. November BRTF meeting (November 29-30, 2005)
 - BRTF to review and provide guidance on preliminary alternative packages of MPAs developed at November CCRSG meeting. SAT and MLPA Initiative staff to provide input into this review.
3. December CCRSG meeting (December 7-8, 2005 in Monterey)
 - CCRSG to consider guidance from BRTF and deliberate on final set of alternate packages of MPAs.

REVISED AGENDA
California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Meeting
 November 9-10, 2005
 Cambria Pines Lodge
 2905 Burton Drive, Cambria, CA

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Present and discuss initial candidate MPA packages
2. Provide CCRSG members with opportunities to caucus (both within and across interest groups) to discuss and refine candidate MPA packages
3. Outline CCRSG presentation to BRTF on candidate MPA packages and next steps for the December CCRSG meeting

MEETING AGENDA

Day 1 – November 9, 2005

Time	Agenda Item
<i>9:30 AM</i>	<i>Arrival, refreshments, greetings</i>
10:00 AM	Welcome, introductions, and agenda review
10:15 AM	Updates and briefings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundfish “hotspots” • Other updates (Attachments 1-4)
11:00 AM	Review process approach for presenting, discussing, and evaluating candidate MPA packages (Handout 4)
11:20 AM	Module 1: Present and discuss initial candidate MPA packages (Handouts 1, 2, 3)
12:00 PM	Public Comment
<i>12:20 PM</i>	<i>Lunch (on site)</i> <i>MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) member presentation:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Ecological Networks of Marine Protected Areas”. Dr. Steven Gaines, Marine Science Institute, University of California, Santa Barbara
1:20 PM	Module 1 (cont.): Present and discuss initial candidate MPA packages
<i>2:50 PM</i>	<i>Break</i>
3:05 PM	Module 1 (cont.): Present and discuss initial candidate MPA packages
5:00 PM	Module 2: Caucusing – Consider new candidate MPA packages or possible revisions to initial candidate MPA packages
<i>5:45 PM</i>	<i>Adjourn</i>
<i>6:30 PM</i>	<i>Group dinner (The Black Cat Bistro, 1602 Main Street, Cambria, CA 93428, 805/927-1600)</i> <i>[Note: No evening presentations are scheduled. Continued caucusing/developing of candidate MPA packages is encouraged.]</i>

Day 2 – November 10, 2005

Time	Agenda Item
7:30 AM	<i>Continental breakfast</i>
8:00 AM	Review agenda for Day 2 and Questions from Day 1
8:10 AM	Module 2 (cont.): Caucusing – Consider new candidate MPA packages or possible revisions to initial candidate MPA packages
10:00 AM	<i>Break</i>
10:30 AM	Module 3: Present and discuss revised or new candidate MPA packages
11:45 PM	<i>Lunch (on site)</i>
12:45 PM	Module 3 (cont.): Present and discuss revised or new candidate MPA packages
2:00 PM	<i>Break</i>
2:30 PM	Module 4: Recap progress and plan next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review list of candidate MPA packages• Outline presentation to the BRTF• Identify preparation steps for December CCRSG meeting
4:00 PM	<i>Adjourn</i>

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

1. Meeting summaries -- Interim work sessions
2. Evaluation of existing central coast MPAs (11/4/05 version)
3. Response to CCRSG science questions
4. Memorandum – Pismo Clams

LIST OF HANDOUTS

1. Master list of candidate MPA concepts (as of November 9, 2005)
2. Summary and evaluation of initial candidate MPA packages
3. Central Coast MPA proposals received from sources external to the CCRSG by Oct. 15, 2005
4. Summary of process approach – CCRSG November meeting
5. SAT Presentation handout: Ecological Networks of Marine Protected Areas

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: November 21, 2005

To: Members, MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – November 9-10, 2005 Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Staff

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On November 9-10, 2005, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Cambria, CA. The primary objectives for the meeting were to: 1) present and discuss initial candidate marine protected area (MPA) packages; 2) provide CCRSG members with opportunities to caucus and refine or create new candidate MPA packages; 3) outline the CCRSG's presentation to the MLPA Initiative Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) on candidate MPA packages; and 4) plan next steps for the December CCRSG meeting.

Key outcomes from the meeting are as follows:

- CCRSG members presented and discussed candidate MPA packages. Initially, two packages were introduced: one by commercial and recreational fishing interests, and the other by conservation interests.
- CCRSG deliberations on candidate MPA packages was supported by a series of staff documents and analyses:
 - MLPA Initiative staff distributed the updated Evaluation of Existing Central Coast MPAs (dated November 4, 2005).
 - Ecotrust presented an overview of its research methods and results. Maps containing key microblock information were made available to the CCRSG.
 - Initiative staff provided an overview of the “external” candidate MPA package proposals, assessing the sufficiency of each proposal in meeting the terms of the MLPA Initiative Master Plan Framework (MPF).
- CCRSG members caucused to discuss possible modifications to the initial candidate MPA packages. Confirming these changes will require further checking back with stakeholder constituencies.
- A group of CCRSG members began developing a hybrid candidate package built on emerging areas of convergence between the two initial internal packages.
- CCRSG members discussed preparing for upcoming MLPA Initiative Science Advisory Team (SAT), BRTF, and CCRSG meetings.

Key next steps are indicated in section IV below. The next CCRSG meeting will take place on December 6-7, 2005 in Monterey, CA.

I. Introduction and Outline

On November 9-10, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Cambria, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results. The memorandum is organized as follows:

- I. Introduction and Outline
- II. Workshop Objectives, Participants, and Materials
- III. Key Outcomes
 - A. Distribution of updated evaluation of existing central coast MPAs
 - B. Presentation of Ecotrust research
 - C. Overview of "external" candidate MPA package proposals
 - D. Presentation and discussion of initial candidate MPA packages (Module 1)
 - E. Caucusing (Module 2)
 - F. Presentation of revised or new candidate MPA packages (Module 3)
 - G. Preparations for upcoming MLPA meetings (Module 4)
 - H. Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) presentations
 - I. Public comment
- IV. Near Term Next Steps

II. Meeting Objectives, Participants, and Materials

The primary objectives for the meeting were as follows:

- 1. Present and discuss initial candidate MPA packages
- 2. Provide CCRSG members with opportunities to caucus and refine or create new candidate MPA packages
- 3. Outline the CCRSG's presentation to the BRTF on candidate MPA packages
- 4. Plan next steps for the December CCRSG meeting.

Forty-three CCRSG primary and alternate members attended the meeting. Chairman Phil Isenberg participated on behalf of the BRTF. Doyle Hanan, Steven Gaines, and Rick Starr participated as Central Coast Science Sub-Team (SST) members. Steve Barrager, SAT chair, also participated.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at:
<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meetings.html#centralcoast>.

III. Key Outcomes

A. Distribution of updated evaluation of existing central coast MPAs

Initiative staff distributed to CCRSG members copies of the updated staff Evaluation of Existing Central Coast MPAs (dated November 4, 2005). The updated version addresses comments made by approximately a half dozen CCRSG members and two SAT members.

B. Presentation of Ecotrust research

Mike Mertens (Ecotrust) made a brief presentation of Ecotrust's research aimed at documenting commercial fishing use of specific portions of the central coast study area. He described the data collection methodology and the approach to data processing and analysis. He also provided guidance to CCRSG members for interpreting the results.

Maps containing key results of the research were made available for CCRSG members. These maps showed microblock data on number of fishermen fishing in each microblock, the number of fisheries that occur in particular microblocks, and the relative importance to fisheries of particular microblocks. Mike Mertens stressed that the individual maps could best be understood within the context of the full suite of maps.

John Kirlin (MLPA Initiative staff) noted that these maps were only being made available for the CCRSG meeting and that the research results have not been published on the MPA decision support tool. To ensure confidentiality, these data currently reside only in DFG staff computers.

Further questions and comments on the Ecotrust research may be directed to Mike Mertens at mikem@ecotrust.org.

C. Overview of “external” candidate MPA package proposals

Mary Gleason (MLPA Initiative staff) provided a brief overview of staff's preliminary analysis of six complete and partial “external” candidate MPA package proposals submitted by members of the public. The analysis focused on characterizing the sufficiency of the “external” proposals in meeting the guidelines for submitting MPA proposals as established in Appendix F of the MLPA Initiative Master Plan Framework (MPF).

External candidate MPA package proposals were submitted by NRDC, Oceana, the Point Reyes Bird Observatory (PRBO), and Helping our Peninsula's Environment (HOPE). Individual CCRSG members also submitted the Initial Draft Concept and Revised Draft Concept proposals from the 2001 MLPA effort.

CCRSG members seeking to contact the authors of the “external” candidate MPA package proposals may obtain contact information from Mike DeLapa (MLPA Initiative staff).

D. Presentation and discussion of initial candidate MPA packages (Module 1)

CCRSG members presented a suite of completed and partial initial candidate MPA packages that had been prepared in advance of the meeting. Mary Gleason summarized staff's preliminary analysis of the initial candidate MPA packages. Following the presentations, CCRSG members asked clarifying questions and commented on the strengths and weaknesses of the initial candidate packages.

1. Initial presentation—CCRSG package #1

A group of CCRSG members representing primarily commercial and recreational fishing interests presented a first candidate MPA package (package #1). The package was also based on consultations with other CCRSG members and scientists. Maps showing the candidate package were distributed to CCRSG members.

a. Key features of package #1 include:

- The package is based on 7 core MPA areas targeted toward large adults and larva: North Monterey Bay, Monterey deep – Pacific Grove, Carmel – Pt. Lobos, Julia Pfeiffer Burns – Big Creek, San Simeon – Morro Bay, Diablo Canyon – Pismo/Oceano, and Vandenberg.
- The package consists of 29 individual MPAs: 13 State Marine Reserves (SMRs), 16 State Marine Conservation Areas (SMCAs), and 0 State Marine Parks (SMPs).
- The package is based on the concept of four basic levels of protection:
 - 1) The entire network
 - 2) The network subset where groundfish take is not allowed
 - 3) The network subset of MPAs referred to as “full protection” MPAs (i.e., there are MPAs where only Salmon/HMS, or possibly Spot Prawn trap fisheries are allowed which offer protection on a similar level as that of reserves)
 - 4) The network subset that is reserves
- SMCAs were designated in lieu of SMPs in several instances to simplifying the administration and enforcement of the MPAs.

b. Key clarifying and evaluative comments included the following:

- Initiative staff noted that a few of the individual MPAs in package #1 had been inadvertently omitted from the MPA list and not included in the habitat calculations. Staff will update the staff analysis accordingly.
- Several of the SMRs are smaller than that recommended by the SAT in the MPF.
- A relatively large gap exists between Big Creek and Leffingwell. Participants asked that the rationales for the gaps in the package be better explained.

- Package #1 builds strongly on existing regulatory measures. Participants asked for greater clarification of how the package differs from the status quo.
- Several stakeholders asked for more information regarding the ecosystem benefits of the MPAs in the Monterey peninsula area.
- Participants discussed the habitat in the proposed Diablo MPA can adequately serve as “representative” habitat, given the warmer water temperatures.

2. Initial presentation—CCRSG package #2

A group of CCRSG members representing primarily conservationist interests presented a second initial candidate MPA package (package #2). The package was also based on consultations with other CCRSG interest groups and examination of the “external” MPA proposals and the Initial and Revised Draft Concepts. Maps showing the candidate package were distributed to CCRSG members.

a. Key features of package #2 included the following:

- The package consists of 28 individual MPAs (17 SMRs, 9 SMCAs, and 2 SMPs)
- Ecological anchor sites include: Ano Nuevo, Monterey Canyon, Pt. Lobos, Pt. Sur, Piedras Blancas, and Pt. Conception.
- Deliberate gaps exist around harbors to allow for multiple uses in those areas.
- Package #2 did not include MPAs in the Monterey Peninsula area. The package’s sponsors expected this gap to be filled by a sub-package being developed by non-consumptive diver interests as well as other interests.
- Package #2 focuses primarily on meeting the ecosystem-based goals and objectives of the central coast region. The package also includes MPAs designed to achieve other MLPA goals and objectives, such as those involving monitoring/evaluation and education.
- Package #2 included the elimination of 4 existing MPAs.

b. Key clarifying and evaluative comments included the following:

- Several participants requested more information on the rationale behind the size and spacing of the candidate MPAs (e.g., with relation to larval transport).
- Some concerns were expressed with regard to the potential for displaced fishing effort.
- Several participants asked that the candidate MPAs be re-evaluated relative to socioeconomic data (e.g., in the Pigeon Pt. area).
- Several participants expressed a desire for more discussions on the Buchon SMR and the implications of the trans-continental communications cable.

- Participants expressed a desire to further discuss access to remaining kelp bed leases.

3. Options for candidate MPAs in the Monterey Peninsula area

A group of CCRSG members presented options for potential MPAs in the Monterey-Carmel area. These candidate MPAs were developed primarily by non-consumptive diver representatives in consultation with other CCRSG interest groups.

a. Key features of the sub-package included the following:

- Two optional arrays of MPAs were presented to the group.
- Both optional arrays employ the strategy of segmenting likely reserves into parts as a means of accommodating the region's multiple users.
- The two options differed most significantly in the areas of Cannery Row, Pacific Grove, Carmel Bay, and Pt. Lobos.
- The presenters were interested in exploring CCRSG preferences of the possible options.

b. Key clarifying and evaluative comments included the following:

- Several participants commented that the candidate MPAs did not fairly balance the interests of all of the users in the area.
- Several participants suggested moving the break between the SMR and SMCA in Pacific Grove northward to Pt. Pinos.

4. Initial draft concept

A CCRSG member requested that the 2001 Initial Draft Concept (IDC) be forwarded to the SAT for scientific review. This stakeholder suggested that the IDC may serve the CCRSG as an example of a complete MPA package based on the best scientific information at the time. Participants acknowledged that some of the data upon which the IDC was based (including socioeconomic data) was now somewhat outdated.

E. Caucusing (Module 2)

CCRSG members organized themselves into three separate caucus groups to re-evaluate the initial candidate MPA packages based on comments received.

- One group, consisting primarily of sponsors of package #1, discussed possible improvements to the package.
- A second group, consisting primarily sponsors of package #2, concentrated on completing package #2.
- A third group met to: 1) better delineate the areas of overlap between the two packages, and 2) explore the possibility of developing a new package of candidate MPAs that builds on these areas of agreement.

F. Presentation of revised or new candidate MPA packages (Module 3)

Following the caucus sessions, CCRSG members reported back on the results of their sessions and invited further comments and suggestions. CCRSG members requested that hard copy showing revisions to the initial candidate MPA packages be provided to the CCRSG as soon as possible.

1. Caucus session focused on package #1.

a. Key outcomes include:

- The caucus discussed possible modifications and improvements to package #1.
- Caucus members acknowledged that any changes to the package would be contingent on checking back with the broader constituents supporting the package.
- This caucus received guidance from DFG on enforcement considerations.

b. CCRSG comments and recommended improvements included:

- Explore utilizing temporal regulations to address the issue of fishing off of the breakwater in Monterey.
- The package needs to better address concerns over diver safety at the breakwater.
- The package would be strengthened by capturing some canyon habitat in the proposed Pt. Lobos SMR.
- There appears to be a large gap between Big Creek and Leffingwell that may need to be filled to meet SAT spacing recommendations for MPAs.

2. Caucus session focused on package #2.

a. Key outcomes include:

- The main goal of this caucus session was to delineate candidate MPAs in the Monterey/Carmel area in order to complete package #2.
- Participants reached agreement on a suite of eight MPAs in the Monterey/Pacific Grove/Carmel areas. This suite was based on one of the main options presented in module 1 for this area, with slight modifications to several of the MPAs.
- Caucus members decided to carry forward the other optional suite of MPAs in the Monterey/Carmel area forward as an element of a possible separate package.

b. CCRSG comments and recommended improvements included:

- Several CCRSG members commented that the proposed package was overly restrictive to fishing interests. They suggested several improvements:
 - Shift the southern boundary of the Pt. Lobos SMR north to allow for more fishing in the Yankee Point area.
 - Take the weather break into account in Pacific Grove.
 - Move the SMR/SMCA boundary in the Pacific Grove area to Pt. Pinos to allow for more fishing.
 - Reduce the size of the pinnacles SMR MPA to allow for more spear fishing in the Stillwater cove area.
 - In general, make some of the SMRs into SMCAs to allow for more fishing.
- Persistent kelp beds exist in the northern part of the proposed Pacific Grove SMCA that are of interest to kelp harvesters.
- Participants questioned the enforceability of some of the proposed 60 foot MPA boundaries.
- A concern was raised over the potential impact of large numbers of non-consumptive divers in SMRs in near Cannery Row.
- Participants discussed tradeoffs between preserving rod and reel fishing off of the breakwater and ensuring diver safety in that area.
- Several participants raised the concern of restricted access for free divers.

3. Caucus session to focus on areas of overlap.

Approximately ten CCRSG members met during the caucus period with the stated purpose of: 1) better delineating the areas of overlap between packages #1 and #2, and 2) exploring the possibility of developing a new package of candidate MPAs that builds on these areas of agreement. Caucus members also used the Initial Draft Concept as a science-focused model.

a. Key outcomes included:

- Caucus members discussed their efforts to develop a new candidate MPA package for the central coast study region. They developed the following criteria for the new package:
 - Build on areas of overlap between packages #1 and #2
 - Integrates stakeholder interests
 - Address perceived gaps in packages #1 and #2
 - Emphasize candidate MPAs having the most impact on habitat protection.
- Caucus members presented a substantial but still incomplete package of candidate MPAs. The package did not include candidate MPAs for the Monterey/Carmel area. Furthermore, in other parties of the study area, group members at times recommended the need for an MPA without indicating a specific location or MPA type.
- Caucus members emphasized that their package was still preliminary. They indicated their desire to reconvene as a group to complete the package (package #3).

- b. CCRSG members offered several comments on the preliminary third package, including:
- Several participants commended the efforts of this group to further integrate packages #1 and #2. Some requested that this caucus group extend their efforts to attempt to further integrate MPA concepts and stakeholder interests in the Monterey/Carmel area.
 - Participants offered preliminary feedback on how the proposed new package met or did not meet their particular interests.
 - Some others questioned whether the timing for such a new package was ripe given that packages #1 and #2 were still evolving.

G. Preparations for upcoming MLPA meetings (Module 4)

1. Revisions to candidate MPA packages

Sponsors of packages #1, #2, and #3 all indicated their intentions to further discuss the candidate packages amongst themselves and with their broader constituencies. Sponsors of packages #1 and #2 also indicated their intention to submit revised candidate packages prior to the November 15, 2005 SAT meeting.

Sponsors of package #3 indicated their intent to meet again and to consult with other CCRSG members for the purpose of developing a full package for consideration by the SAT and the BRTF.

Participants acknowledged that each of the three main candidate MPA packages followed the strategy of designating larger numbers of smaller-sized MPAs relative to the guidance provided by the SAT. Initiative staff recommended that the sponsors of each package provide additional rationale for the size and spacing of the candidate MPAs.

Initiative staff indicated that the different candidate packages may proceed toward SAT and BRTF review along different timelines. Staff also noted that CCRSG members and other interested parties will have opportunities to comment upon and participate in discussions supporting evolution of these packages as they move to the BRTF, then to the DFG and finally to the Fish and Game Commission, the policy maker.

Initiative staff reminded CCRSG members that candidate packages #1, #2, and #3 were still “works in process” and should be represented to the general public as such.

2. Request for information

- Participants requested that the SAT or Initiative staff provide additional guidance on the trade-offs between size and spacing of MPAs.

Participants also acknowledged that spacing between MPAs is complicated by the use of two methods for measuring distance in the MPA decision support tool (i.e., as crow flies, and every nook and cranny).

- Participants requested that the SAT provide additional guidance as to whether highly restrictive, deep-water SMCAs may be viewed as the functional equivalent of SMRs.

3. Preparations for upcoming MLPA meetings

a. SAT meeting

At the November 15, 2005 SAT meeting, SAT members will provide scientific review on packages #1-3. The focus will be on the degree to which the candidate packages achieve the scientific guidelines established by the SAT in the MPF.

SAT members will also provide scientific review on the Initial Draft Concept as well as the complete “external” proposals.

CCRSG members are requested to provide updated versions of packages #1-3 to Initiative staff by 9:00 AM on November 14, 2005. Initiative staff will prepare a summary analysis for SAT review.

b. BRTF meeting

The BRTF will meet on November 29-30, 2005 to provide preliminary guidance on the candidate MPA packages and to respond to CCRSG questions. Initiative staff requested that two CCRSG sponsors of each of the candidate packages be available to interact with BRTF members.

BRTF Chair Phil Isenberg encouraged CCRSG members to strive to achieve as much convergence among the candidate MPA packages as possible.

CCRSG members requested that the BRTF address the following question:

- Are there ways that the BRTF can incentivize the CCRSG to move their candidate MPA packages as far along as possible?

c. December CCRSG meeting

To prepare for the December CCRSG meeting:

- Initiative staff will summarize the outcomes of SAT review and BRTF guidance on the candidate MPA packages and external proposals discussed and provide this to the CCRSG in advance of the December CCRSG meeting.
- Staff will conduct an assessment across the candidate packages.
- CCRSG members will provide descriptions of individual MPA objectives.

During the December CCRSG meeting:

- CCRSG members will assess all of the candidate MPA packages being proposed.
- Staff plans to use straw voting to assess levels of support for the candidate MPA packages and “external” MPA proposals.

H. Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) presentations

MLPA Initiative SAT member Dr. Steven Gaines (Marine Science Institute, University of California, Santa Barbara) made a presentation on Ecological Networks of MPAs during lunch on Day 1.

I. Public comment

Six members of the public provided comments. Some represented organizations that had submitted external MPA proposals. These individuals indicated their organizations’ intent to send revised proposals to Initiative staff by November 14, 2005 for SAT review. Others offered support for specific MPA concepts. One individual described some of the constraints place by MPAs on fishing.

IV. Near Term Next Steps

A. Key next steps for CCRSG members

- CCRSG members to discuss potential additional modifications to their packages with constituents “back home.”
- CCRSG to transmit revised versions of their candidate MPA packages to Initiative staff by 9:00 AM on November 14, 2005 to have them considered by the SAT. The SAT will consider the most up-to-date versions of the candidate packages available.
- CCRSG to provide descriptions of individual MPA objectives for the December CCRSG meeting.

B. Key next steps for Initiative staff

- Initiative staff to prepare a summary analysis of completed candidate MPA packages and “external” MPA proposals for SAT review.
- Initiative staff to prepare hard copy maps showing updated versions of packages #1-3 and transmit these to CCRSG.
- Initiative staff to request that two CCRSG sponsors of each of the candidate packages be available to interact with BRTF members at the November 29-30, 2005 BRTF meeting.

PROPOSED AGENDA
California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Meeting
 December 6-7, 2005
 The Beach Resort Monterey
 2600 Sand Dunes Drive, Monterey, CA

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Report on SAT guidance, BRTF review, and staff analysis on candidate MPA packages
2. Invite presentation and discussion on revised candidate MPA packages
3. Assess CCRSG support for respective candidate MPA packages
4. Outline presentation for January BRTF meeting
5. Conclude CCRSG work with thanks and appreciation

MEETING AGENDA

Day 1 – December 6, 2005

Time	Agenda Item
<i>9:30 AM</i>	<i>Arrival, refreshments, greetings</i>
10:00 AM	Welcome, introductions, and agenda review
10:15 AM	Updates and briefings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of staff evaluation of packages (Handouts 2, 3, 4) • Other updates (Attachment 1)
10:30 AM	Report back from SAT and BRTF deliberations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recap SAT review of candidate MPA packages (Handout 1) • Recap BRTF commentary and guidance on candidate packages • Review next steps in MLPA process, post December CCRSG meeting (Handout 5)
12:00 PM	Present revised candidate MPA packages; focus on modifications since November CCRSG meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal Packages (#1, #2, #3)
<i>12:30 PM</i>	<i>Lunch (on site)</i>
1:30 PM	Present revised candidate MPA packages (cont.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal Packages (#1, #2, #3)
2:30 PM	Discuss revised candidate MPA packages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compare by sub-region (focus on ecological and socioeconomic pros/cons) • Identify issues for BRTF
<i>4:00 PM</i>	<i>Break</i>
4:15 PM	Public Comment
4:35 PM	Caucus deliberations - focus on possible refinement of candidate MPA packages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present guidance for caucuses: goals, participation, reports back on Day Two
<i>5:30 PM</i>	<i>Adjourn</i>
<i>6:30 PM</i>	<i>Group dinner (Note: No evening presentations are scheduled. Continued caucusing/refinement of candidate MPA packages is encouraged.)</i>

Day 2 – December 7, 2005

Time	Agenda Item
7:30 AM	<i>Continental breakfast</i>
8:00 AM	Review agenda for Day 2 and Questions from Day 1
8:10 AM	Provide guidance for completing MPA proposals, including preparing individual MPA objectives
8:30 AM	Present and discuss refined candidate MPA packages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlight key revisions
10:00 AM	<i>Break</i>
10:45 AM	Assess support for candidate MPA packages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review approach to straw voting • Conduct straw votes
12:00 PM	<i>Lunch (on site)</i>
1:30 PM	Discuss outcome of straw voting and outline presentation to BRTF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present and discuss outcomes of straw voting • Document any final adjustments to packages • Outline key points for BRTF presentation • Clarify questions, as needed, about next steps in the process
2:45 PM	Closing remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From CCRSG Members • From I-Team • From BRTF Member(s)
3:30 PM	<i>Adjourn</i>

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

1. Revised list of species likely to benefit from MPAs

LIST OF HANDOUTS

1. Summary of SAT review of candidate MPA packages (as presented at November 29-30, 2005 BRTF meeting)
2. Updated candidate MPA package summaries, with summary cover sheets and maps
3. Comparison of MPAs and regulations for internal packages
4. Overview of area in each type of MPA for all packages
5. Overview of next steps in MLPA process, post December CCRSG meeting

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: December 12, 2005

To: Members, MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – December 6-7, 2005 Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Staff

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On December 6-7, 2005, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Monterey, CA. The primary objectives for the meeting were to: 1) report on Science Advisory Team (SAT) guidance, Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) review, and staff analysis on candidate Marine Protected Area (MPA) packages, 2) invite presentation and discussion on revised candidate MPA packages, 3) assess CCRSG support for respective candidate MPA packages, 4) outline the presentation for the January 29 – February 1, 2006 BRTF meeting, and 5) conclude plenary CCRSG work with thanks and appreciation.

Key outcomes from the meeting are as follows:

- CCRSG members responded to BRTF request to winnow and evaluate candidate MPA packages. Specifically, the CCRSG winnowed the number of packages under their active consideration from 8 packages to 3.
- CCRSG members ranked the candidate MPA packages and listed specific revisions to improve those packages that were not their preferred ones.
- CCRSG members continued the process of seeking to increase the areas of convergence and decrease areas of divergence among remaining packages.
- CCRSG members identified “point persons” for each of the three active candidate MPA packages to assist future coordination and consultation between stakeholders and staff.
- CCRSG members received guidance from Initiative staff on how to complete their candidate MPA packages, including the development of objectives for individual MPAs, by the December 15, 2005 deadline.
- CCRSG members received a briefing on next steps in the Central Coast process.
- The CCRSG concluded its work as a formal body.

Key next steps are as follows:

- CCRSG members are to submit final candidate MPA packages, and associated objectives for individual MPAs, to Initiative staff by 8:00 AM on December 15, 2005. Materials should be sent via email to MLPAcomments@resources.ca.gov.
- Other key next steps are indicated in section IV below.

I. Introduction and Outline

On November 9-10, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Cambria, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results. The memorandum is organized as follows:

- I. Introduction and Outline
- II. Workshop Objectives, Participants, and Materials
- III. Key Outcomes
 - A. Review and discussion of SAT and BRTF guidance on candidate MPA packages
 - B. Presentation of revised candidate MPA packages
 - C. Assessment of CCRSG support for the candidate MPA packages – Straw voting and interim caucusing
 - D. Designation of “point persons” for continuing correspondences and consultations
 - E. Request for submittal of final candidate MPA packages (by December 15, 2005)
 - F. Guidance on preparing final candidate MPA packages
 - G. Information to report back to the BRTF
 - H. Public comment
 - I. Closing remarks
- IV. Recap of Next Steps

II. Meeting Objectives, Participants, and Materials

The primary objectives for the meeting were as follows:

- 1) Report on SAT guidance, BRTF review, and staff analysis on candidate MPA packages
- 2) Invite presentation and discussion on revised candidate MPA packages
- 3) Assess CCRSG support for respective candidate MPA packages
- 4) Outline presentation for January BRTF meeting
- 5) Conclude plenary CCRSG work with thanks and appreciation

Forty-five CCRSG primary and alternate members attended the meeting. Meg Caldwell participated on behalf of the BRTF. Rick Starr, Dean Wendt, Mary Yoklavich, and Mark Carr participated as SAT members.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at:
<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meetings.html#centralcoast>.

III. Key Outcomes

A. Review and discussion of SAT and BRTF guidance on candidate MPA packages

Initiative staff and SAT members summarized the results of the SAT and BRTF reviews of candidate MPA packages (versions submitted by November 18, 2005). This included 5 packages advanced by CCRSG members and 3 packages produced by external stakeholders.

1. SAT review

Dr. Rick Starr (SAT member) reviewed the SAT's preliminary evaluation of the candidate MPA packages. The SAT's analysis focused on the biological and ecological dimensions of the packages and included evaluations of MPA size and spacing and habitat coverage. Dr. Starr also discussed the implications of habitat availability and existing data gaps on the analysis.

Dr. Starr emphasized that this analysis was an important first step in an ongoing scientific review process. Additional SAT review will follow completion of final CCRSG candidate MPA packages on December 15, 2005. [See section IV below for other next steps.]

CCRSG members requested that improved information be provided as soon as possible on the location of hard bottom habitat in the southern portion of the central coast study region. Some members noted that this information may most easily be derived by analyzing commercial passenger fishing vessel (CPFV) data or talking with local fishermen who fish in that area.

2. BRTF guidance

John Kirlin and Scott McCreary (Initiative staff) discussed some of the outcomes of the November 29-30, 2005 BRTF meeting. While the BTRF did not pass any formal motions regarding revision of the candidate MPA packages, Task Force members offered several pieces of advice and guidance in their deliberations.

- BRTF members encouraged CCRSG members, in revising their packages, to give considerable weight to the advice of the SAT.
- BRTF members urged candidate MPA package proponents to look seriously at areas of overlap and work to develop more unified approaches for some geographic areas.
- BRTF members urged package proponents to reduce the number of geographic areas for which alternate packages contain competing proposals.
- BRTF members expressed a preference to see the CCRSG advance a bounded number of packages (closer to 3 or 4 rather than 7 or 8) to the BRTF at its January 31 – February 1, 2006 meeting.
- BRTF members expressed the view that the CCRSG has a strong incentive to keep working and move closer to a convergence at its December meeting.

After the December CCRSG meeting, the focus of policy advising and consultation will shift more to the BRTF, the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), and the Fish and Game Commission.

- BRTF members recognized that the MLPA process is dynamic and ongoing. They expressed interest to know the relative support for the respective candidate MPA packages as they stand at the December CCRSG meeting.
- As well, BRTF members expressed interest in learning about the distribution of support for different MPA packages. That is, they were interested in knowing not just CCRSG members' first choices but their second and third choices as well.

3. Areas of strong convergence among candidate MPA packages

Initiative staff listed areas of strong overlap among the candidate MPA packages (versions submitted November 18, 2005). These occurred in the following candidate MPAs:

- Ano Nuevo intertidal State Marine Reserve (SMR)
- Sandhill Bluff/Natural Bridges Intertidal SMR
- Elkhorn Slough and Morro Cojo Slough SMR
- Pacific Grove Intertidal SMR
- Soquel Canyon State Marine Conservation Area (SMCA)
- Carmel Pinnacles SMR
- Point Lobos Nearshore SMR and off-shore SMCA
- Cambria SMP and SMCA
- Morro Bay SMCA

Key issues to resolve include specific MPA boundaries, allowable take in SMCAs, and "no take" components in some SMCAs.

B. Initial presentation of revised candidate MPA packages

Proponents of candidate MPA packages #1, #2, and #3 presented revisions to their packages and described how these revisions addressed SAT comments and recommendations. Initiative staff provided CCRSG members with summaries of the updated packages (Handout #2).

Key features of the updated packages included the following:

- Package 1 included two variants on the configuration of an MPA in the Julia Pfeiffer Burns area (option 1 and 1b), with identical outer boundaries. Package 1 proponents asked to carry both variants forward and seek the advice of the SAT before selecting between them.
- Package 2 and 2b were identical except for the boundaries and use restrictions in MPAs in the Monterey Peninsula area. Revisions to package 2 only concerned MPAs outside of the Monterey Peninsula area. (Note: a unified package 2 was announced on Day 2 that included a revision on the Monterey Peninsula.)
- Package 3 had received the most revisions since the November meeting. Package 3 revisions were informed by general SAT guidance as well as SAT package-specific comments provided for the other packages.
- Packages 4, A, B, and C had received no revisions since the SAT review.

CCRSG members reiterated their intentions to continue revising their packages to meet future SAT guidance.

C. Assessment of CCRSG support for the candidate MPA packages – Straw voting and interim caucusing

1. Purpose of straw voting

Initiative staff led CCRSG members through a series of straw votes. Only primary CCRSG members, or their designated alternates, participated in the voting. The primary purpose of the straw voting was to:

- Respond to BRTF guidance
- Winnow the number of packages to a more manageable number that best reflects regional goals and objectives, design and implementation considerations, and CCRSG interests
- Create an opportunity for CCRSG members to express relative preferences on an array of evolving packages (for this particular moment in time)
- Provide an opportunity for CCRSG members to reflect on potential revisions that could make specific packages more acceptable

2. Structure and organization of straw voting (including interim caucusing)

The straw voting proceeded in three rounds plus an interim caucus period:

a. Round 1 straw voting

The purpose of round 1 (Day 1) was to winnow the number of packages to be moved on to round 2 and ultimately forwarded to the BRTF. Participants voted on the versions of the packages presented earlier on Day 1.

b. Round 2 straw voting

The purpose of round 2 (Day 1) was to rank the packages as a means of encouraging further convergence among the packages and informing future possible revisions.

c. Interim caucus period

Round 2 was followed by a caucus period that extended from late afternoon on Day 1 through lunch on Day 2. CCRSG members were invited to meet both within and across interest groups to discuss possible refinements to the candidate MPA packages and to look for ways to narrow areas of divergence.

Key outcomes of the caucus period include the following:

- Proponents of package 1 developed a list of possible future revisions based on discussions with proponents of package 3.
- Proponents of packages 2 and 2b consolidated their packages into a single revised “package 2” with a new MPA complex in the Monterey Peninsula area.

- Proponents of package 3 indicated their intent to revise their package based on discussions with proponents of packages 1 and 2.

d. Round 3 straw voting

The purpose of round 3 (Day 2) was to: 1) rank the current packages in terms of preference, 2) score the current packages in terms of level of acceptability, and 3) provide CCRSG members with the opportunity, for each candidate MPA package that was not their preferred package, to identify up to three critical changes to specific MPAs that would make the package more acceptable.

CCRSG primary members who did not participate in a particular straw vote, and whose alternates did not participate in their stead, are invited to convey their views on the issues addressed in round 3 of the straw voting to Initiative staff (at MLPAcomments@resource.ca.gov). Staff will forward these comments, along with the straw voting results, to the BRTF. Note: unlike the straw voting results, these supplemental comments will not be confidential.

3. Results of straw voting

a. Round 1 Straw Vote (Day 1)

In Round 1, participants were asked to indicate their single-most preferred package. The results of round 1 are shown below. Packages needed to receive at least 3 votes (approximately 10% of the CCRSG primary members) to move on to the next round.

Package	Received more 3 or more votes
CCRSG package #1 – 1b	yes
CCRSG package #2	yes
CCRSG package #2b	yes
CCRSG package #3	yes
CCRSG package #4	no
External package A	no
External package B	no
External package C	no

Five CCRSG members were absent or chose to abstain on this straw voting round.

b. Round 2 (Day 1)

In Round 2, participants were asked to rank the four packages that moved on from round 1 (packages 1, 2, 2b, and 3). Participants were invited to designate up to one package as “unacceptable” (marked with a “U”). The results of round 2 are shown below.

Package	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Rank 4	Number of Unacceptable rankings
CCRSG package #1 – 1b	13	2	1	11	9
CCRSG package #2	5	6	14	2	2
CCRSG package #2b	4	5	4	14	12
CCRSG package #3	5	14	8	0	0

Five CCRSG members were absent or chose to abstain on this straw voting round.

Initiative staff presented this summary and asked the CCRSG to use the results of this voting to inform their caucusing during the late afternoon and evening of Day 1 and morning of day 2.

c. Round 3 (Day 2)

Prior to round 3, CCRSG members reported back on the results of the caucusing. The only change to the packages was that package 2 and 2b had been consolidated into a new “package 2.”

In round 3, participants were asked to do the following:

- 1) Rank order their preferences for all of the current packages (1 = first choice, 2 = second choice, 3 = third choice)
- 2) Score each the three current packages in terms of level of acceptability (A = acceptable, B = needs minor changes, C = needs moderate changes, D = needs major changes)
- 3) For each candidate MPA package that was not their preferred package, identify up to three critical changes to specific MPAs that would make the package more acceptable

The quantitative results of round 3 are as follows:

Package	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	No. of A's	No. of B's	No. of C's	No. of D's
Package 1	15	2	10	12	4	1	10
Package 2	10	1	16	9	1	3	14
Package 3	2	24	1	2	4	15	6

Five CCRSG members were absent or chose to abstain on this straw voting round.

Staff committed to compile the comments made regarding improvements to specific MPAs and forward these to CCRSG members within the next 2 days.

D. Designation of “point persons” for continuing correspondence and consultations

The following individuals were designated as “point persons” for packages 1-3 respectively:

- Package 1: Steve Scheiblaue and Howard Egan
- Package 2: Kaitilin Gaffney and Ron Massengill
- Package 3: John Pearse and Michelle Knight

E. Request for submittal of final candidate MPA packages (by 8:00 AM December 15, 2005)

Initiative staff invited CCRSG members to make additional revisions to their candidate MPA packages and to inform them with BRTF guidance, SAT guidance, CCRSG caucusing, and the straw voting results from the December CCRSG meeting. Initiative staff reconfirmed the deadline as 8:00 AM on December 15, 2005 for submittal of final candidate MPA packages. Final packages should be emailed to MLPAcomments@resources.ca.gov.

F. Guidance on preparing final candidate MPA packages**1. General guidance on formulating regulations for MPAs**

John Ugoretz (DFG staff) provided guidance to help package proponents refine potential restrictions for MPAs along the central coast. In particular, John provided guidance for establishing consistency of language and structure across packages.

2. Guidance on developing objectives for individual MPAs

Paul Reilly (DFG staff) presented guidance for preparing the objectives for individual MPAs in the packages being carried forward in the MLPA process. Paul presented the following guidance for assuring internal consistency within an MPA objective package:

- Link each MPA objective to a regional goal and objective using a letter and number symbol, e.g. G1O1 = regional goal 1, regional objective 1.
- To the extent possible, use the corresponding language in the linked regional objective for an MPA objective, with modifications as appropriate.
- Ensure that any habitats specifically identified in an MPA objective do in fact occur within the MPA.
- Ensure that any species likely to benefit that are identified in an MPA do in fact occur within the MPA. Consult with staff, SAT, fishermen, or divers, for advice.

Paul reiterated that staff is available to provide additional assistance upon request.

Final objectives for individual MPAs are due on December 15, 2005, along with final versions of candidate MPA packages. Staff will then review the MPA objectives for internal consistency, accuracy, and appropriateness, will provide suggested revisions, and will return them to the package contact designee for review. Staff will also provide the packages of MPA objectives to the SAT for their review.

G. Information to report back to the BRTF

CCRSG members recommended that the report back to the BRTF for its January 2006 meeting include the following information:

- Review the entire process by which CCRSG members developed the candidate MPA packages.
- Describe the process by which CCRSG assessment of the candidate MPA packages (i.e., the straw voting) took place. Be explicit about the version of each package that was the subject of each respective round of straw voting.
- Report that CCRSG members have indicated their willingness to make additional changes to increase convergence of the candidate MPA packages and to meet SAT guidance.
- Emphasize that all of the candidate packages, regardless of the sponsors, are the results of intense negotiations among constituencies and across all of the interest groups represented at the CCRSG.
- Recognize that all of the candidate MPA packages are very different from the “wish lists” that stakeholders might have had in mind at the onset of the CCRSG process. As such, they reflect many discussions and compromises.
- Acknowledge the immense amount of learning that has taken place during the MLPA process for all CCRSG members.

H. Public comment

Eight members of the public provided comments. In general, they offered support for specific candidate MPA packages.

I. Closing remarks

Several CCRSG members and Initiative staff make closing remarks. Among the recurring themes were; the high quality of engagement, the quality of discourse, and the level and professionalism of the work products and process. John Kirlin (Initiative staff) specifically praised the CCRSG’s contributions to public democracy. Scott McCreary complimented the CCRSG on their willingness to educate each other about their respective interests, their hard work and willingness to work with the aggressive timeline, their willingness to reach across traditional interest “boundaries”, and their capacity for reflection.

John Kirlin noted that the MLPA Initiative will engage in a robust “Lessons Learned” effort, and expects to be in touch with CCRSG members in the coming months to reflect on the CCRSG process and outcomes.

John Kirlin and Michael DeLapa (Initiative staff) then presented certificates of participation, signed by Mike Chrisman (Secretary, California Resources Agency), Ryan Broddrick (Director, California Department of Fish and Game), and Phil Isenberg (Chair, Blue Ribbon Task Force). The certificates thanked each primary member and alternate for their tremendous dedication and invaluable service in helping the State of California implement the Marine Life Protection Act along the central coast.

IV. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for CCRSG members

- CCRSG members to submit final candidate MPA packages, and associated objectives for individual MPAs, to Initiative staff by 8:00 AM on December 15, 2005. Send via email to MLPAcomments@resources.ca.gov.
- Package proponents will be given the opportunity to revise their packages following the January 31 - February 1, 2006 BRTF meeting.
- Key opportunities for CCRSG members to continue providing input in the MLPA process include:
 - Send written comments to MLPAcomments@resources.ca.gov
 - Provide public comment at January and March BRTF meetings
 - Provide public comment at Fish and Game Commission hearings

B. Other next steps

1. Immediate

- Staff to compile the straw voting round 3 comments made regarding improvements to specific MPAs by December 9, 2005.

2. December 2005

- Staff to post final candidate MPA packages to website for review (mid-late December)
- Staff and SAT to analyze candidate MPA packages (late December/early January)

3. January-February, 2006

- SAT to meet January 20, 2006 to review final packages
- Staff to incorporate SAT evaluations into its analyses and post information to the MLPA website (late January)
- BRTF to meet January 31 – February 1, 2006 to consider packages and evaluations, and hear public comment
- Staff to post BRTF guidance to MLPA website and invite public comment (early February)
- As directed by BRTF, staff to work with stakeholders and SAT to refine candidate MPA packages (February)

4. March 2006

- SAT to meet March 2, 2006 for further evaluations

- Staff to incorporate SAT evaluations, public comment, and other information into options for BRTF action (early March)
- BRTF to meet March 14-15, 2006 to make its recommendation to DFG
- Staff to post BRTF decision to MLPA website (mid/late March)

5. April 2006 and thereafter

- DFG to consider recommendation from BRTF, make a decision on a preferred alternative, and forward a recommendation to the Fish and Game Commission (May 2006). [Note: All packages that have been considered throughout the MLPA process (internal to the CCRSG as well as external) will be forwarded to the Fish and Game Commission for consideration.]
- DFG to begin CEQA analysis (May 2006)
- Fish and Game Commission to receive the DFG recommendation and begin public hearings
- Fish and Game Commission to take action as early as late 2006

6. Other next steps

- Staff to follow up with selected CCRSG members to discuss “lessons learned” from the CCRSG process.